DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 242 HE 006 604

AUTHOR Wren, Scott C., Ed.
TITLE Student Participation in the Governance of Institutions of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE Jan 75
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Annotated Bibliographies; College Administration; Decision Making; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Student Participation; Trustees; University Administration

ABSTRACT

This bibliography represents a survey of selected works on student participation in academic decision making published between 1968 and 1974. It is divided into three major areas. The first section, 81 items, is concerned exclusively with student participation in academic decision making, focusing on models, justifications, attitudes, and current practices. The 39 items in the second section examine the student role in the broader context of campus and institutional governance, including alternative governance structures, goals and objectives of governance, and the distribution of power within various institutions. The 17 items in the third section deal with literature devoted to unicameral, or broadly based, decision-making bodies which incorporate all campus constituencies into a single policy making structure. (Author/JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111242

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE GOVERNANCE OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

An Annotated Bibliography

Edited by Scott C. Wren

January 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006607

Vice President--University Relations
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

INTRODUCTION

This bibliography represents a survey of selected works on student participation in academic decision making. It is divided into three major areas:

I. The literature concerned exclusively with student participation in academic decision making, focusing on models, justifications, attitudes, and current practices (Items 1-81, pages 1-38);

II. The literature examining the student role in the broader context of campus and institutional governance, including alternative governance structures, goals and objectives of governance, and the distribution of power within various institutions (Items 82-121, pages 39-56); and

III. The literature devoted to unicameral or broadly-based, decision-making bodies which incorporate all campus constituencies into a single policy-making structure (Items 122-139, pages 57-65).

Most of the literature on student participation in the governance of institutions of higher education appeared during the student protest era from the time of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964 until shortly after the Cambodian invasion in 1970. During this time, students were urged by campus officials to seek constructive change through nonconfrontation tactics. After the campuses returned to relatively normal conditions in 1970-71, institutional efforts to strengthen student input diminished markedly. Much less was written on the subject, too, which may be indicative of this development. Apparently, once the immediate crisis had passed, many institutions assigned a lesser priority to the evaluation of the roles and responsibilities of students in institutional governance.

Many of the more recent articles suggest, however, that the governance crisis may not be over. Current trends toward powerful external student lobbies and collective bargaining, coupled with declining enrollments and rising tuition, form a potentially explosive situation. Indeed, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education noted that "it is highly possible that a new period of student activism will occur again in the future--it would be quite remarkable if it did not." (Governance of Higher Education, 1973, page 55.) Going even further, the Commission warns that "new confrontations on campus and off are just as possible in the future as the potentialities for such future confrontations are blindly ignored in the present." (Final Report: Priorities for Action, 1974, page 4.) Support for the Commission's position

can be found in much of the literature covered by this bibliography. This commentary suggests that colleges and universities should seriously consider examining their existing governance structures in order to determine whether they are likely to function effectively in the decade ahead.

The author acknowledges his debt to Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson, Carol H. Shulman, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Many annotated citations from their previous works are included in this bibliography.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION iii

SECTION I.
STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

A. Theory, Models, and Opinion 1

B. Research on Attitudes, Practices, and Trends 21

C. Institutional Reports, Recommendations, and Guidelines 29

SECTION II.
CAMPUS AND INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

A. Theory, Models, and Opinion 39

B. Research on Decision-Making Authority 47

C. Institutional Reports, Recommendations, and Practices 51

SECTION III.
BROADLY-BASED DECISION-MAKING BODIES

Research and Reports on Unicameral Governance 57

SECTION I. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

PART A. THEORY, MODELS, AND OPINION

1. Alexander, William M. "Rethinking Student Government for Larger Universities." Journal of Higher Education 40, January 1969, pp. 39-46.

   The author suggests a unique form of student government and outlines some of its features. The representatives to a student parliament would be selected by petition on a ratio of one representative to twenty petitioners. A cabinet would be elected from the parliament to prepare the parliamentary agenda. The parliament would meet two hours per week and would be directly responsible to the university president. (Shulman)

2. Betts, William W., Jr. Hermes and Apollo. Address to the Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., Washington, D.C., December 4-6, 1969.

   Many of those who oppose student participation in academic governance argue that the students are not qualified to plan essentially professional services. This is not what most students want; they want to be acknowledged and taken into account. They want to participate in the governance of the university not out of a desire for power, but to improve the institution. Others argue that most students are not interested in governance, or that their transitory presence at the university makes their participation in decision making undesirable. But students form a permanent constituency. Evidence indicates that faculty and administration can benefit from student consultation. Students have already effected changes in their programs and will continue to do so. Both undergraduate and graduate students have an obligation to participate in academic administration. (ERIC)

3. Bloustein, Edward J. "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges." Liberal Education 54, October 1968, pp. 345-364.

   The purpose of this paper was to inquire into the reasons for and the nature of the student assertion of a right to share in the management of the American

college and university. The author describes the classical American college and contrasts it with today's institutions. He then details how the emergence of the "new student" may be traced from weaknesses in each of the characteristic elements of the classical college system--the hierarchical structure of authority, the fixed and ordered system of certain knowledge, a rigidly defined and severely limited set of educational functions, and a completely paternalistic relationship between the student and the college. (Shulman)

4. Bond, Linda. Collective Bargaining and Its Impact on the Learning Environment: The Need for a Closer Look. Speech presented to the Conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 1974.

   Student concern regarding faculty unionism stems from the possible impact unionism will have on the quality of instruction and on student participation in governance. The author notes that most colleges have adopted a bilateral industrial-type bargaining process that excludes students from participation. She argues that education is a process, not a product to be viewed in terms of a producer-consumer model. Distinctions should be made between collective bargaining in the industrial and public service sectors, and more attention should be given to the impact faculty collective bargaining will have on the learning environment in educational institutions. Because faculty collective bargaining has gone beyond economic issues, students must involve themselves in the bargaining process or forfeit their role in university decision making. The only way student participation can be ensured is by stipulating it in enabling legislation. Students should not be content with observer status; they should have the right to participate in discussions, to be represented by counsel, and to caucus. Finally, students should have veto power over specific issues, such as student evaluations of teaching for faculty promotion and review, class size, grading policy, etc. (Wren) See also 6, 8, 27, 36, 37.

5. Bowles, W. Donald. "Student Participation in Academic Governance." Educational Record 49, Summer 1968, pp. 257-262.

   This author discusses the power structure of higher education institutions and suggests how students who wish to achieve real influence should approach the task. Basically, his prescription is to keep in mind how academic governance actually does take place, not how it should take place. This necessitates identifying the mainsprings of power in a given institution in

order to determine where to begin. The department is named as a likely target. The author suggests ways students might make themselves more acceptable to the powers that be.

Although it is not uncommon to find sympathizers for the student power movement among administrators, it is rare to find one who describes methods for obtaining influence. (Shulman)

6. Brandes, Frederic M. "Point of View: Students Should Take Part in Collective Bargaining Between Faculty and University." The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 16, 1973, p. 12.

Students have the right to participate in collective bargaining for two major reasons. First, students have a community of interest which includes matters under negotiation. Second, exclusion of students from the negotiations would damage their academic environment. The author notes that the college exists primarily to teach students, and not to set the terms and conditions for the employment of teachers. Thus, the student "community of interest" is built upon maintaining academic freedom in the terms and conditions of education. And when conditions of employment affect conditions of education, students are vitally interested in protecting the quality of their education. Students have been excluded from participating in collectively bargained agreements in the past because of adherence to the narrow industrial model. But the author notes that the public service sector negotiates issues like academic freedom, tenure and governance, which takes collective bargaining out of the industrial sphere, and thus he calls for participation of student representatives in negotiations. (Wren) See also 4, 8, 27, 36, 37.

7. Brunson, May. "Student Involvement in University Governance: Sense or Nonsense?" Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 32, Summer 1969, pp. 169-175.

The author lists several of the traditional arguments against student involvement such as immaturity, transiency, lack of legal responsibility, and apathy--and then refutes each one. She feels that a major factor affecting the type of involvement is institutional size. She advocates student participation, arguing that: the institution should be viewed as a community including the students; students have potential for making worthwhile contributions; the experience offers training for leadership and is good for student morale.

She then lists some approaches to student participation which have been taken by various institutions. (Shulman)

8. Bucklew, Neil S. "Unionized Students on Campus." Educational Record 54, Fall 1973, pp. 299-307.

   This article explores the possibility and the implications of student involvement in collective bargaining through forming independent student unions. The author discusses this subject from three vantage points: as a student, as a university employee, and as an affected third party. Experiences at a number of campuses are traced for possible indications of future trends. The article closes with a list of advantages and disadvantages of the student union model. The author also notes that, while firm conclusions about student collective bargaining cannot be drawn at present, where the labor relations model has been sought by a constituency, it has eventually been put into practice--first informally, then by law. (Wren) See also 4, 6, 27, 36, 37.

9. Carter, E. S. Planning Students' Roles in Emerging Universities. Address to the Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U. S., Washington, D. C. December 5, 1969.

   An imaginary consultant (with some resemblance to the author) makes a survey of graduate student-faculty relations and their views of their decision-making roles. The results of the survey are intended to guide deans of graduate schools in emerging institutions in working out suitable roles for graduate students in academic decision making. Based on the findings, the consultant made the following observations: (1) Carefully selected representatives of modern student groups may be more influential in making changes than any other single group. (2) Selecting student representatives is a critical step. Those most anxious to represent their peers are not necessarily the ones who will take the time and assume the responsibility of participating sufficiently and effectively. (3) Avoid, planning, including long-range planning, FOR students; plan with them. (4) Don't be surprised to find students who want neither the opportunity to take over, nor the responsibility of running the whole university. (ERIC)

10. Committee on the Student in Higher Education. The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Connecticut: Hazen Foundation, January 1968.

The Committee on the Student in Higher Education conducted an 18-month study of various social and psychological influences that shape student attitudes, interests, and activities and presents several recommendations that it believes could improve the quality of higher education. The report is based on the assumption that the college is a major agent in promoting the personality development of the young adult between the ages of 17 and 25, and must therefore assume responsibility for the quality and direction of this development. The Committee does not take issue with the traditional emphasis of higher education on intellectual development, but stresses a current need for the kind of intellectual development that has some visible impact on the student's life, values, feelings, goals, and deeds. Developmental education is suggested as an effective way of providing the student with a college experience that integrates his cognitive development and the development of his whole personality. Other recommendations include a reorganization of instruction in the freshman year, the recruitment of competent faculty who are primarily concerned with the developmental experience of undergraduates, increased student participation in educational policymaking, and opportunities for student volunteer work. (ERIC)

11. Ferguson, Donald G. Student Involvement: A Working Paper. Paper presented at Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 1971.

    Students are clients of the educational system, but traditionally have had little voice in decision-making about the services they receive. Students are now demanding greater involvement, and administrators have tried a number of programs designed for student participation, generally with success. Some examples of successful programs are (1) student centers that provide a focus on students and serve to improve relations with students, (2) inclusion of students on deliberative and decisionmaking bodies to encourage greater communication and understanding between staff and students, and (3) involvement of students in producing innovative educational programs and services that better meet the needs and interests of students. (ERIC)

12. Frankel, Charles. "Student Power: The Rhetoric and the Possibilities." Saturday Review 51, November 2, 1968, pp. 23-25.

    This article is a general essay on the topic of student involvement in governance. The author begins by discussing the ramifications of the use of slogans and phrases common to the movement. He then relates how

students have influenced the evolution of educational theory and practice in the past. Now the question is not whether students have the right to say something, but whether it would be educationally desirable to create arrangements permitting a more visible and formal participation in the making of academic decisions. He feels that if people have some power over the way in which they live and work, they will have more interest in their experiences, learn more from them, and tend to become more responsible. Nevertheless, the author would limit student power, and would not approve of student involvement in faculty selection and retention. (Shulman)

13. "Governing Boards: Trustees Strive to Close Generation Gap--But Not By Opening Board to Students." College and University Business 47, April 1969, p. 24.

    Trustees from ten universities comment on their relationship to the students in their institutions. The general consensus is that: times are changing; a trustee's role is changing; and students should not be represented on governing boards. There is no identification of what a "new" role or "new" demands will entail. (Shulman) See also 47.

14. "Governing a College: The Pros and Cons of Student Involvement." College Management 4, May 1969, pp. 40-44.

    Two faculty members from the University of Delaware debate the role students should play in the selection and retention of faculty, in curriculum decisions, and in choosing a president. The feelings and attitudes expressed toward student involvement are basically ambivalent. (Shulman)

15. Heffner, Ray L. "The Student Vote in Institutional Policy." A.G.B. Reports 10, February 1968, pp. 3-10.

    Speaking from his experience as president of Brown University (Rhode Island), the author discusses the role of the president in current times. He gives some of the history of Brown and relates it to current concerns. He also relates how Brown's regulations on student conduct were modified. His three prescriptions for institutional progress are: (1) enunciate institutional goals and seek understanding and acceptance by all elements of the academic community; (2) accept students as junior partners in the enterprise; (3) provide alternatives in which experimental approaches can develop, so that components of the community, such as the students, are not faced with the choice of either accepting or rejecting the "system." (Shulman) See also 19, 73.

16. Henderson, Algo D. "The Administrator-Student Conflict." The Administrative Law Review 21, November 1968, pp. 65-77.

Colleges are undergoing a transition from having responsibility for the protective care of students in loco parentis to the position of treating and counseling students as young adults. Many administrators are academic specialists, but are not prepared to respond to the basic questions raised by students about the university's role as an educational institution and its role in society. The growing permissiveness of parents and exposure to today's communications media have produced more sophisticated college-age children over whom administrators can no longer assume an arbitrary authority. Administrators are usually confronted with problems arising from 1 of 2 sources: (1) militant student and faculty insistence that the institution should take leadership in social action, and (2) student pressures for change in the institution itself. The numerous criticisms that evolve from these sources seem to be justified. Unfortunately, many administrators have resisted new ideas and maintained bureaucratic modes of administration, actions that have turned student aggressions from the solution of educational problems to the achievement of student power. It is suggested that administrators be more qualified for their responsibilities. It is felt that they should have qualifications in addition to a reputation as a scholar or a scientist, in order to communicate effectively with modern students. (ERIC)

17. Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Students and An Intellectual Community." Educational Record 49, Fall 1968, pp. 398-406.

In this article the author touches on the topic of student participation in governance. He believes the view that students are well equipped in terms both of competence and longevity on campus to participate meaningfully in academic governance has more validity than customarily assumed. He supports his contention by comparing the campus adults' way of life to that of the students. He claims the notion of "readiness" is used to hold students back, whereas there is evidence that five- and six-year-olds are able to build their own curriculum in a disciplined way. (Shulman)

18. Johnstone, Bruce D. "The Student and His Power." Journal of Higher Education 40, March 1969, pp. 205-218.

The author discusses six methods of exercising informal, indirect or lower level student power which would bring

the total student body into an effective decision-making role. He feels that such mechanisms "constitute a far more fruitful approach to the entire set of issues concerning student power than do the traditional models of formal student government and joint governing committees." Students can attain power through: (1) lower level planning, such as the joint planning of individual courses. (This would involve students in departmental and divisional policy making.) (2) individual programs, such as credit by examination, independent study and individualized programming. (This would transfer power from faculty to students.) (3) indications of consumer preference. (4) involvement in the faculty reward system, such as publishing, course and teacher evaluations, and compelling faculty to prepare students for externally administered examinations. (5) the exposure of alternatives in experimental colleges. (6) the expression of dissent, such as lobbying, ad hoc committees and underground publications.

Since the "disenchanted perceive themselves as unable to influence events and unable to gain respectful recognition, the heart of student discontent is the proper decision-making role of college students. The author discusses the limitations of various traditional mechanisms of participation, such as communications channels, student councils, and joint committees. (Shulman)

19. Joughin, Louis. The Role of the Student in College and University Government. Address at the Symposium of Academic Freedom and Responsibility, California State College, Los Angeles, May 22, 1968.

If an institution of higher education is to function, it is necessary that all components--trustees, administration, faculty, and students--fulfill their individual responsibilities. However, students cannot fulfill their responsibilities for self-development unless they are allowed certain rights and freedoms. Any college or university can benefit from the talents of its students. To facilitate their involvement, institutions should: (1) provide for more information exchange; (2) consult with students; and (3) give students decision-making responsibility in many areas of university life and complete responsibility for some areas of student life. As "consumers" of institutional services, students should be heard on all academic matters that concern them. The proper student role in non-academic life is difficult to discover, but a good beginning can be made in intensive cooperative study--such as that at Brown University and Pembroke College. A great deal of misunderstanding between

students and the local community might be avoided by instituting channels of communication. Students have valid complaints about the conditions of the country and should not hesitate to offer considered approaches to solving our problems. There is no group better qualified to improve the colleges and universities than the students in them. (ERIC) See also 15, 73.

20. Kerlinger, Fred N. "Student Participation in University Educational Decision Making." Teachers College Record 70, October 1968, pp. 45-51.

This author opposes giving students university or college decision-making power. He bases his stand on three criteria--legitimacy, responsibility, and competence--and explains how their application would disqualify students from areas of governance. If students were allowed to vote, he says, the result would be both a weakening of the educational program and a change in the nature and purpose of the university. (Shulman)

21. Main, Jeremy. "The 'Square' Universities are Rolling, Too." Fortune 79, January 1969, pp. 104ff.

This is a general article about the current expansion of student involvement into a wide range of university affairs. The author makes distinctions among the types of involvement according to the levels at which participation takes place. One level is that of student affairs in which students are self-governing, e.g., in dormitories. Another is that of the joint committee (student-faculty or student-administrator) concerned with housekeeping matters such as parking. The third is that of the joint committee which deals with educational policy such as curriculum and tenure--the heart of university policy making. (Shulman)

22. Marchese, Theodore J. "Student Participation in Plans Is No Longer a Question of Whether, But How?" College and University Business 47, August 1969, pp. 37-38.

This article makes a strong plea for genuinely involving students in governance. The author lists two main reasons for his stance. It would be a means of improving the range and quality of advice while enlarging and enriching the input into the planning process. The experience would also provide maximum opportunity for student growth and fulfillment. He points out practices in the past which have belied the significance of involvement. Involvement implies more than having two students attend a monthly planning meeting: "the planner-educator needs to sense that student participation has to be practically on student terms." (Shulman)

23. Martin, Warren Bryan. "Student Participation in Academic Governance." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

As a rationale for his approval of substantive student participation in academic policy formation and institutional governance, Martin lists and then refutes the arguments usually given the opposition. (1) Students are immature and lack the experience needed for such responsibility. But, as consumers, students can contribute a unique view of the classroom and educational process. (2) Students have only a short-term affiliation with the school, thus their loyalty toward it is limited. But, the average tenure of college and university presidents is about four years, and the faculty value job-mobility and their professional guilds above their institutions. (3) If students can do a better job than the faculty, they ought to be doing the teaching. This reaction is extreme; there is no evidence that more than a tiny minority of students want to take over the university, in the classroom or anywhere else.

Martin discusses the reasons why the prospects for significant student participation are poor and challenges colleges and universities to become organized into tripartite communities in which faculty, administrators and students all share in forming and implementing policy. He outlines the framework of a proposed university-wide council. (Shulman)

24. McDonough, John R. "The Role of Students in Governing the University." A.G.B. Reports 10, April 1968, pp. 24-31.

This author opposes extending student participation in college and university decision making, arguing that it should not be a democratic process. He draws an analogy between a hospital and the university. Patients do not manage the hospital. The student's position is that of a patron or consumer who can discontinue his patronage or go elsewhere.

The author does say students have the right to be heard. But even granting this much complicates the governance process because: students think problems are urgent; new students have to be continually filled in on the issues; and students do not have to live with the decisions which are made. He then discusses the Committee of Fifteen established at Stanford to discuss university problems and policies with power only to make recommendations. (Shulman)

25. McGehee, Nan E. Faculty and Students, or Faculty Versus Students. Speech given at meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Chicago, November, 1969.

In an attempt to discover why students are demanding participation in the decision-making processes of the university, the author examines four of the most common issues they have raised: (1) student conduct codes and disciplinary procedures. This is an area in which modern college students reject institutional authority; (2) a voice in the hiring, promotion, and discharge decisions with reference to faculty, and sometimes administrators. This issue seems to stem from students' concern with instructional quality; (3) curriculum planning. A major concern is for the relevance of undergraduate education to students' needs, goals, and lives in general; and (4) admissions and graduation requirements, grading systems, and other matters which lead to certification. Today's students come to college with the intent of learning "how to make life good to live" rather than "how to live the good life." Because students and faculty are more heterogeneous than before, are more aware of social issues, and are less patient with the traditionally slow academic pace, it would seem that the goals of colleges need to be changed from those stated 20 years ago. Conflicts seem to stem from the college goals perceived by faculty and administration as opposed to those seen as appropriate by students. When communication among faculty, students and administration breaks down, or the students are unable to bring about changes by going through regular channels, then demonstrations take place. (ERIC)

26. McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

Revolutionary changes are occurring in the structure of government in American colleges and universities, and some of the most significant changes are related to the role of students in academic governance. This book reviews (1) the history and present practices of student involvement in governance: the early student and faculty guilds, the rise of paternalism, the indirect influence students have always exerted, and the successful experiences at Antioch and in Canadian universities; (2) the arguments for and against student participation which include on the one side the sophistication of students today, the need to educate students for a democratic living, the abolition of in loco parentis, and the possibility that students can help to improve instruction and higher education as

a whole, and on the other side the fear that students will dominate academia, the immaturity of students, their brief involvement in the institution, their ignorance of professional values, and interference with study and employment; and (3) problems of student participation, including selection methods and voting rights, and techniques for achieving this participation, which include restructuring academic government, specific preparation for governmental services, and making it feasible to the students. The appendix includes some tables on student participation in selected policy-making bodies. A bibliography concludes the book. (ERIC)

27. McHugh, William F. "Collective Bargaining and the College Student." Journal of Higher Education 42, March 1971, pp. 175-185.

The author argues that students will become substantially involved in collective bargaining because faculty will seek to introduce matters which will affect student self-interests into the bargaining process. Also, because students are now participating in many areas of decision making which may become the domain of collective bargaining agreements, they would be eliminated from the governance structure if not accommodated in the bargaining process. The author does not recommend that students be involved as principals in negotiations, but as an interested third party presenting their views on relevant issues during fact-finding or arbitration proceedings. The negotiated contract itself may provide for student participation where post-contract procedures or committees are created to resolve a particular problem or to make a study. (Wren) See also 4, 6, 8, 36, 37.

28. Mitau, Theodore G. Student Participation in Campus Government. Paper presented to Student Convocation, St. Cloud College, St. Cloud, Minnesota, February 18, 1969.

There is no doubt that U. S. institutions of higher education are often encrusted with traditions to the point where they no longer meet contemporary faculty and student needs. It is high time for educators in the U. S. to admit that there is much merit in student desires for participatory campus governance, without which colleges and universities may cease to exist as viable and dynamic centers of intellectual growth. But the students' right to speak, protest, organize, and demonstrate for greater social justice and their perception of a more mature society must

be safeguarded within the framework of campus law. Three considerations are offered that could ensure continuous inter-communication between students, faculty, and administrators. First, each campus should have an up-to-date table of organization that reveals the major decision-making agencies and responsible personnel. Second, each student leader should have a clear-cut understanding of his campus organization, and take responsibility for explaining it to his fellow students. Third, student leaders and faculty members should be continously informed on the status of their suggestions, petitions, and requests in the campus governmental structure. A part of the educational experience should be experimentation with structures within which students, faculty, and administrators may solve problems in an environment of mutual respect and trust. (ERIC)

29. Morris, Arval A. Student Participation in University Decision Making. 1969.

The causes of student rebellion against established social and educational systems are rooted in many forces that impinge upon their lives, three of which are rapid social change, affluence, and the fear of technological death. The firm conviction of the "new left" activists--the third generation of radical, militant students--is that they must do something about social problems that alienate human beings, such as poverty, racism, militarism, urbanization, and war. Believing themselves to be vitally affected by university policies and practices, students are claiming a democratic right to participate in institutional decision making. But within the university, each of the many communities should decide its own affairs, and conditions necessary for democracy do not exist. However, three areas in which just student demands could be met involve (1) voting on non-academic policy such as the right to control their private and social lives on campus, (2) voting on non-academic questions that concern the entire university community, such as allowing cars on campus, and (3) an effective voice in certain academic areas such as curriculum, effective teaching, examinations, and grading, on which they would not vote but could be consulted and, when possible, accommodated. The principle of consultation and accommodation would help to resolve the problem of student participation in decision making, make constructive use of students' energies, and protect colleges and universities from outside forces. (ERIC)

30. Pelczar, Michael Y., Jr. The Relative Roles of Faculty and Students in Academic Decision-Making. Address to the Meeting of the Council of Graduate Students of the U. S., Washington, D. C., December 5, 1969.

Student-faculty participation in academic decision making should exclude those who see this process in terms of a power struggle. Though students have been effectively and productively involved in decision making for generations, the current demand for multi-level involvement differs because it represents a grasp for student power. If decision making includes the collection and interpretation of facts, students and faculty are equally qualified to do the first, but faculty by virtue of experience may be more qualified to do the latter. However, students and faculty can work together to develop sound solutions to university problems. As Kingman Brewster has stated: the great majority of students do not want to spend much of their time and energy in the guidance of governance of their university. In addition, it is important to recognize that a student generation lasts for only four years and students are therefore not accountable for the policies they help devise. While students should serve along with faculty on university committees, their role in decision making should be limited to policies that will have short-range effects. (ERIC)

31. Powell, Robert Jr. "Participation Is Learning." Saturday Review 53, January 10, 1970, p. 56ff.

The subject of the twelfth annual symposium cosponsored by the Saturday Review and the Committee for Economic Development was "Who Runs the University?" Most of the material presented at the meeting is included in this issue. The student's perspective is provided by Robert Powell, past president of the U. S. National Student Association. He argues that student power is aimed at changing the undemocratic character of universities, and describes steps that must be taken to enable students to take responsibility for their own learning. Most important, the current grading system must be abolished and the monopoly of faculty power over key academic decisions broken. Many examples of how students can help to shape university policies are given. Some of the other papers recommend increasing student participation in governance but none of them develops the rationale for doing so as carefully as this one. (Shulman)

32. Roth, Darlene. Graduate Students and Academic Affairs. Address to the Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U. S., Washington, D. C., December 5, 1969.

The participation of graduate students in academic decision making is not only desirable, but necessary and inevitable. The momentum of the reforms at the undergraduate level is now carrying over to graduate schools. Students no longer consider graduate education a privilege, but a right to advanced training and to something besides a "worthless" degree. They want involvement, and the opportunity to establish new criteria for educational professionalism, which emphasize the quality of teaching and service to school and community. Long a fragmentized group, graduate students are now organizing to improve their position. The faculty is generally more concerned with publishing and consulting than with teaching, and their loyalty is not to the student or university, but to the outside world. As a result, students have not been getting the instruction they deserve. Graduate students could be effectively involved in bridging the gaps between undergraduates and faculty by acting as counselors for undergraduates, as critics and evaluators of the educational process, and as members of university committees and advisory councils. (ERIC)

33. Schwartz, Edward. "Student Power: In Response to the Questions." The Future Academic Community. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

In order to make the student quest for power more readily understandable, it is necessary to put forward the general propositions of student demands. The demand for student power arises only after students have become dissatisfied with university policy, when trust between administration and students has broken down. First, students want control over their own affairs, especially in the area of parietal rules where the issue is enmeshed in the overall generational battle over personal morality. Second, within the area of teaching and curriculum, only students are solely concerned about good teachers and judge professors almost exclusively on the standard of their teaching ability. Third, because students are more acutely concerned with the moral implications of the university's financial investments and interaction with the wider community, they contend they should participate in institutional decision making. When leaders of the society and the university resist the kinds of changes

that students propose, the students then demand institutional power to enact the changes themselves. (ERIC)

34. Scranton, William. The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

The commission recommended that students, faculty and staff should have increased participation in the formulation of policy. Competence and the degree that decisions affect a group should be major criteria for determining involvement. Procedures for electing representatives of constituencies should be designed to guarantee representativeness. The commission concluded that governance reforms should not undermine administrative leadership, but should be designed to produce policies and leaders with broad support of the community. (Wren)

35. Shaffer, Jay C. "Students in the Policy Process." Journal of Higher Education 41, May 1970, pp. 341-349.

The author notes that effective student participation in the policy process depends upon involving representative students and manageable numbers. He sees student governments as the only viable vehicle for achieving effective participation. But a vital student government is not developed by urging students to be better citizens and vote, or by telling student leaders to "become more representative." Students will vote only when their self-interest demands it. The main reason for the lack of interest in student government is the absence of power and influence; therefore, the author believes it is necessary to invest extensive power in the hands of the student government. The reader is cautioned not to equate student apathy with student conservatism, as the goals of student leaders are tacitly supported by a large segment of the student population. The author outlines several handicaps in achieving effective student participation in the policy process. He also recommends that students receive academic credit for their participation, and have staff support and access to the same information available to the faculty and administration. (Wren)

36. Shark, Alan. "A Student's Collective Thought on Bargaining." Journal of Higher Education 43, October 1972, pp. 552-558.

This article presents a case for the direct participation of students in collective bargaining. The author says the majority of colleges in the U. S. have no

formalized effective grievance procedure for students. Had students been recognized in the past as a collective force with vital interests, many confrontations might have been avoided. At the City University of New York, where the faculty has unionized, no attention has been given to the rights and prerogatives of students. So while unionized faculty pursue better teaching conditions, students must pursue better learning conditions without the benefits of collective bargaining. Faculty conditions of employment can be compared with student conditions of enrollment. Faculty protect academic freedom, i.e., what they teach; students must protect academic freedom, i.e., what they learn. Because faculty contracts range from the realm of economic issues to the realm of academic freedom, the author argues that students should participate in collective bargaining through a tri-partite process: students, faculty, and administration. The only legitimate means of achieving academic freedom for students is through sharing academic responsibility. (Wren) See also 4, 6, 8, 27, 37.

37. Shark, Alan R. "Viewpoint: The Students' Right to Collective Bargaining." Change Magazine, April 1973, pp. 9ff.

The author argues that the industrial model of collective bargaining which clearly establishes a relationship between the employer and employee is inappropriate for higher education. Faculty contracts have been concerned with more than economic issues. Such issues as governance and educational policy have also been considered. Both economic and noneconomic issues affect students greatly and students must have a mechanism such as collective bargaining to defend these interests. Students will have to demonstrate that they can establish organizations which provide for greater accountability to their constituents. The author argues that since many of the areas of concern to students also concern faculty and administration, a tripartite contract would be most desirable. (Wren) See also 4, 6, 8, 27, 36.

38. Shoben, Edward Joseph, Jr. Student and University Governance. Buffalo: State University of New York, 1969.

It is necessary to provide organizational and political bases from which genuine student influence can be exercised if we assume that (1) extensive and meaningful participation by students in university governance is likely to be a permanent feature of academic life; (2) participation legitimately represents serious

student concerns and provides a channel for their contributions; (3) construction of suitable machinery for greater participation is the only process by which students can become fully committed members of the academic community. To be effective, forms of representation must be personalized and demonstrably linked to humane goals. One possible governance arrangement conceives of the central administration as analogous to the federal executive, and the Faculty Senate and Student Assembly as upper and lower houses of the legislature. Service in the Assembly would be tied to special related academic programs and awarded academic credit. To ensure that the Assembly was truly representative, the student body would be divided into "districts" of about 100-200 members who would elect a representative to the Assembly. Districts would be organized around common ideological interests. Judicial functions could be exercised in a variety of ways, involving, perhaps, distinctive trial courts and appellate tribunals. These provisions briefly outline one response to the fundamental question of what constitutes the appropriate basis of authority in the contemporary university. (ERIC)

39. Spurr, Stephen H. The Relative Roles of Faculty and Students in Decision-Making. Address to the Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U. S., Washington, D. C., December 5, 1969.

Although student participation in academic decision making has become generally acceptable, there is still controversy about who has the ultimate decision-making authority within the university: the faculty or students. Historically, universities based on faculty power, prevalent in northern Europe and the U. S., have in general been governed by consensus methods and have been productive in scholarship, while universities in which student influence is strong have become highly politicized and have generally ceased to be academically distinguished. The U. S. university has been based on the "generational concept" in which the faculty alone are the enfranchised citizens of the community and students pay for the privilege of attending the institution. Students are objecting to that concept and see the university more as a city-state in which there should be only one class of citizen, with equal rights in the decision-making process. When the faculty attempts to compromise on these issues, it may compromise on the principles on which the university is based. Direct and formal student involvement is desirable. But, in the final analysis, the faculty must determine what standards of behavior

are to be required of all in the interest of the continued existence and development of the university. (ERIC)

40. St. John, Edward. Students in Campus Governance: Reasoning and Models for Student Involvement. Davis: University of California, Department of Applied Behavioral Science, June 1973.

This report posits that governance change is a prerequisite to institutional reform. The author feels that the inclusion of students in the vital processes of the university is overdue. The study traces the history of student participation up through 1960 and makes recommendations, with extensive justifications, for new models of student participation. The report outlines two alternatives: (1) Students can be considered the third major power and be given delegational authority strong enough to check the other two, or (2) the governance process and structure can be reevaluated and modified to include students. (Wren)

41. St. John, Edward. "Students Work from Within Now to Influence the Governance of Higher Education." California Journal 4, May 1973, pp. 169-172.

The author discusses new student attempts to gain influence in academic decision making by working within the institution. He cites evidence from the University of California, Davis, which shows that students can influence decisions even if they are not accepted as equal partners with the administration, but he notes that most daily decisions on that campus continue to be made without student involvement. He argues that the governance system must be modified towards creating a more democratic institution--i.e., one which involves those who are affected by decisions. He adds that just because the number of students on committees increases, it does not mean they are becoming a major force in the decision-making process. The eventual goal should be to create a governance system consistent with the uniqueness of each campus and in keeping with the concept of community government. (Wren)

42. Student Participation in College and University Government: A Report of Committee T. American Association of University Professors, 1970.

This report attempts to determine the principles and to identify several appropriate areas of student participation. The report recommends that students be

involved in academic affairs in the areas of admissions, academic programs, academic courses, academic evaluation, and the academic environment. It leaves to individual institutions the determination of the mode and extent of the involvement. In extracurricular affairs and student regulations, students should have primary responsibility and should participate in establishing standards and procedures for student discipline. (Wren) See also 116, 119.

43. Susman, Warren I. Is Increased Participation in Decision Making Enough? Paper presented at the Conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 2, 1970.

Much of the student rebellion has been attributed to the impersonality of the academic institution, and through the 1960's it was believed that all problems could be solved through increased student participation on college and university committees. Though increased participation has met with some success, it is by no means the major reform in governance that is needed to make academic institutions more responsive to current needs. Student representation has not really been representative of the student body; the membership of governing bodies has been changed, but the nature and function of the university has not been defined. Perhaps, instead of ignoring the students, the university has traditionally been too protective of students. The time has come for the university to withdraw as completely as possible from all nonacademic areas of student life and welfare, and transfer responsibility to the students themselves. If the university abandons some of its welfare state role, it may be able to concentrate more on learning and teaching or possibly extending educational opportunity more widely. And in rethinking its welfare function, the university should not only think of the students, but of the greater needs of the whole community. (ERIC)

44. Wheeler, Burton M. Students and the Shaping of the Curriculum. Paper presented at the Conference of American College Personnel Association, St. Louis., March 18, 1970.

Whenever the issue of student participation in curriculum reform is raised, the opposition can be expected to express itself in two ways: (1) the rational argument which justifies faculty control in terms of rightness; and (2) entrenchment or keeping control away from the activists. There are costs and risks, as well as potential gains in greater student participation. There are also costs and risks to denying

student participation. While defending the prerogatives of the faculty with regard to curriculum planning in the fields of specialized, preprofessional training, students should be involved in working out effective ways of accomplishing the real objectives of liberal education. Reasons for student involvement include: (1) faculty often solve curriculum problems by adding courses; (2) often faculty have no skills for curriculum development; and (3) the experience and insights gained by these students who do help plan will become part of the student culture. Problems that are possible with student planning include: (1) many students feel they cannot change anything around them; (2) students become entrapped in their own organizational patterns; (3) students are anxious for adult approval; and (4) a sense of impermanence hovers over student groups. (ERIC)

PART B. RESEARCH ON ATTITUDES, PRACTICES, AND TRENDS

45. Armstrong, Ronald. Student Involvement: Analysis and Bibliography, Series No. 14. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1972.

Intended primarily for educational administrators, this review presents an analysis of the literature concerning student participation in educational decisionmaking. The educational and legal ramifications of student involvement in several decisionmaking spheres, such as school board and committee membership, student government, extracurricular activites, student publications, and curriculum issues, are discussed. Some suggestions are given to administrators for channeling student energies into a constructive improvement of the educational program. A 54-item bibliography of related literature is also included. (ERIC) See also 59, 60, 61, 102.

45. Baver, Otto F. "Student Trust at Berkeley." Educational Record 52, Fall 1971, pp. 361-367.

The author reports on a survey of student trust of the faculty and administration in Berkeley during 1970. With a possible low score of 10 and a high of 70, results showed student trust of faculty at 54.348, and of administration at 43.15. An analysis of the data in terms of demographic breakdowns revealed no significant differences in response. The author links

these scores to the quality of communication and degree of cooperation between the two groups. He concludes with several suggestions for increasing trust in a university setting. Most important is the task of creating structures of university governance which facilitate communication and interrelationships among students, faculty, and administration. Competition should be avoided in the problem-solving process; the administration should try to create an atmosphere in which students are motivated to cooperate with other groups in the decision making process. (Wren)

47. Blanford, Barbara A. Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1972.

The results of this survey on student participation on college and university governing boards indicate that 14% of all institutions in the U. S. have students as members of their boards. Of the different institutional types, public 4-year colleges and universities stand at one end of the scale with about one in four including students on their governing boards, and the 2-year colleges stand at the other, with only 8% of the public and 6% of the private 2-year colleges having students on their boards. Of the 86% of the institutions that do not now have students as members of their boards, 63% indicated either that they have had no plans for considering the possibility or that they have considered the possibility but are taking no definitive action. Concerning the possible authority students have as members of governing boards, of the 14% of institutions that do have students on their boards, less than half permit voting on all issues and 58% indicated that students were not permitted to vote on any board issues. (ERIC) See also 13.

48. Carr, Alden J. Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration. AACTE Study Series No. 4. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1959.

This study reports the findings obtained from a questionnaire returned by 109 institutions belonging to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The areas in which students participate in determining general policy and the channels through which this participation takes place were ascertained. Respondents indicated the extent and value of present and probable future levels of student participation. Generally, it was felt that participation should be

increased, but that it should be accompanied by adequate evaluation. A short historical section and recommendations are also included. Although this study is dated, it is worth mentioning because of its systematic approach. (Shulman)

49. Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions. Washington, D. C.: Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1968.

This compilation documents steps taken by approximately 90% of the state universities and land-grant colleges to involve students in governance, and to develop policies and procedures aimed at handling disruption. Part I, dealing with student participation in university policy making, is subdivided into: participation in governance, membership on committees, participation on search and screening committees, self-studies and evaluations, communication and consultation with students, involvement with boards of trustees, ombudsmen and adoption of student suggestions. Part II contains policies on obstruction and disruption, student codes, preparedness for disruption, policies and practices regarding police, and policies on firearms. The survey strongly indicates that universities have "been making diligent efforts to deal with legitimate concerns." (ERIC)

50. Davis, John B. A Survey of Practices Related to Student Membership on Academic Committees. Greenville, N. C.: East Carolina University, 1969.

This study was conducted to determine the prevalent practices of selected institutions of higher education concerning student membership on academic committees, and on certain other governing groups. Questionnaires were sent to 85 institutions and 59 were returned and analyzed. More than 85% of those that replied indicated that students serve on one or more academic committees, and almost half reported that students also serve on other governing groups. Students are most often involved on committees concerned with the admissions and financial aid programs, curriculum, library, calendar, and guidance programs of the university. Almost 60% of the institutions reported that student committee members are elected by the student body. The general trend regarding qualifications is the requirement that a student be a full-time undergraduate, and an upperclassman. Student participation is generally successful, as 43 of 52 institutions

reported that student contributions were "moderate" or "substantial." Approximately 90% of the institutions indicated that student membership on academic committees was initiated at their schools after 1960. Tables document responses to the questionnaires and appendices include a copy of the questionnaire and names of the institutions to which they were sent. (ERIC)

51. "Governing a College: How Much Should Students Have to Say?" College Management 4, May 1969, pp. 53-54.

The views of 212 deans of students were obtained on several aspects of student participation in decision making. Responses to each question were tabulated for the total and by type of institution: university, four-year, and two-year colleges. The results give a good picture of the amount of participation students now have and in which of eight areas: clubs, dorm rules, discipline, curriculum, faculty appointment, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. It was found that students have the least to say about faculty appointments, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. For the same eight areas, deans indicated whether the current voting power of students was "too little," "enough" or "too much." About one-half believed that current student participation was too low. Sixty-five percent reported appeals for a larger role in governance at their institutions. Sixty-one percent believed that student members of governing bodies were as responsible as the regular members. The faculty was seen as most resistant to change.

This is an extremely good, current survey on the topic of student participation in governance. Although the results are based on less than one-half of the total sample, similar trends were found in later returning responses. (Shulman)

52. Hawes, Leonard C. and Trux, Hugo R. "Student Participation in the University Decision-Making Process." Journal of Higher Education 45, February 1974, pp. 123-134.

This study, conducted at Ohio State University, evaluates four major functions of the committee process at that institution as they relate to student participation in the university decision-making process: decision making, representation, feedback, and delay. The report notes that neither faculty nor student members have clearly defined constituencies. The authors argue

that student participation has been effective but that its potential for power integration on campus has not been fully realized. (Wren)

53. Hodgkinson, Harold L. Student Participation in Campus Governance. Paper presented at the AERA Conference, Los Angeles, 1969.

The concept underlying the research discussed in this paper is that governance has to do with the perceptions of campus problems held by different groups and the perceptions of those who are knowledgeable and influential in dealing with these problems. Data were collected from over 3,000 persons on 19 selected campuses, and more than 900 interviews were held with students, faculty, administrators, department chairmen, and trustees. At some institutions, the administration and faculty favored student participation on the grounds that better decisions would result, while at others students were placed on major committees merely to "take the heat off." Administrators at some institutions asserted that students should have absolutely no say in the governance of the institution, while some at others gave students more responsibility than they were willing to accept. In most situations, student participation in governance has worked well, but problems that they face include the inflexibility of some administrative structures, the lack of information on budgetary and other fiscal matters, and the diversity of student bodies for whom no one student representative can speak. However, data show that students are more concerned about the quality of teaching than are faculty or administrators, and because of this reason they are needed to improve the quality of university decision making. (ERIC)

54. Lunn, Harry H., Jr. The Student's Role in College Policy Making. A report prepared for the Commission on Student Personnel. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

This book is largely a descriptive report emphasizing throughout specific examples of different forms of student involvement in administration and policy formation. It is an important source in the study of this topic as a social movement. (Shulman)

55. McGrath, Earl J. "Student Governance and Disorder." Change Magazine 3, May/June 1971, pp. 10ff.

This article summarizes a study of a random sample of institutions taken from a population of more than 800

colleges and universities. The results show that there was no escalation of student protests following increased student involvement in governance. According to the author, student participation in policy-making bodies actually reduced disorders in a large number of institutions. He notes that students in almost all institutions were cooperative, often adding substantial information, enriching discussions, and contributing to a broader understanding of the issues under discussion. Several liabilities of student participation are documented, and the author suggests remedies to make participation more effective. (Wren)

56. Milton, Ohmer. Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW), May 1968.

Many students seek and many administrators have called for greater student involvement in important academic decision making. And because faculty members, who control most academic policies and procedures, have remained strangely silent about such matters, it was decided to investigate, in a more detailed and systematic fashion than had been done previously, their attitudes toward student participation in determining cogent campus policies. At the same time, an effort was made to obtain data that might indirectly reflect the conventionality of faculty thinking about approaches to teaching and learning. A randomly selected sample of 200 faculty members was interviewed at four colleges and two universities. "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" answers to questions regarding specific areas of student participation (e.g., curriculum planning) could be qualified. There was general agreement that students should participate extensively in matters of student discipline, but not in the affairs of a legal governing board. They should be encouraged to complete evaluative types of questionnaires on teachers, but the results should be seen only by the teacher concerned. In other areas, a "Yes" vote meant only that student ideas should be heard, but the means for obtaining their views is left unclear. This study has been highly limited in its sampling of institutions, and more land-grant colleges and universities should be sampled via mailed questionnaires. (ERIC)

57. Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes are Catching Colleges By Surprise: A National Survey Shows." College and University Business 47, July 1969, pp. 29-31.

Of 1769 institutions surveyed for significant changes in governance during 1968, it is not clear how many

institutions reported changes. The data were analyzed by type of control, regional accreditations, state, enrollment, level of degree programs, type of academic programs, and board size. They revealed that the most frequent means of involving both faculty and students was through increasing membership on standing and advisory committees. Other types of change are listed in order of the frequency of occurrence, but their frequency is not given. The author notes that the kinds of change reported were almost as numerous as the institutions reporting them. (Shulman)

58. A Report on State System Provisions for Student Participation in Governance and for Student Conduct and Discipline. Salem: Oregon State Board of Higher Education, July 1969.

The purposes of this report were: (1) to provide information concerning the policies of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education as they relate to institutional governance, with particular reference to student participation; and (2) to provide a description of the policies and practices adopted in the colleges and universities of the state system regarding student participation in institutional governance, and student conduct and discipline. The report presents: (1) a brief statement of the legal authority of the Board to enact rules and bylaws for its institutions; (2) a review of the essential features of the Board's policy statement on institutional governance, with particular reference to student participation; (3) a summary of institutional efforts to implement Board policies with regard to student participation in governance; and (4) an appendix which presents the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, prepared by 33 representatives from ten national educational organizations. (ERIC)

59. Robinson, Lora H. and Shoenfeld, Janet D. Student Participation in Academic Governance, Review 1. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

This report deals with the growing student role in college and university administration. It contains an essay reviewing trends and findings in the literature, a lengthy annotated bibliography, and a compendium of recent institutional changes which have increased student participation in governance. The bibliography is divided into six sections: Surveys of Current Practices, Survey of Attitudes, Arguments For, Against, and About Student Participation, Hypothetical Models of Governance, Methods of Increasing Student Involvement, and Institutional Proposals to Increase Student Involvement or Establish New Governance Structures. The compendium

covers: Addition of Students to Existing Bodies, Formation of New Committees, and New Governance Structures. Most of the items in the compendium are concerned with changes in private institutions of higher education. (ERIC) See also 45, 60, 61, 102.

60. Robinson, Lora H. and Shoenfeld, Janet D. Student Participation in Academic Governance, PREP-15. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

PREP-15, a review and annotated bibliography, focuses on the topic of "Student Participation in Academic Governance." This kit of six documents deals with the topic of student participation: (1) Survey of Current Practices and Policies; (2) Survey of Attitudes; (3) Arguments For, Against, and About Student Participation; (4) Models of Governance; (5) Methods of Increasing Student Involvement; and (6) Institutional Proposals for New Governance Structures. A seventh document includes a listing by university and state of recent changes in governance. (ERIC) See also 45, 59, 61, 102.

61. Sceiford, Chester L. and Wheeler, Ray E., Jr. University Governance: Current Changes and an Annotated Bibliography: Bloomington: Indiana University, December 1970.

The first section of this report discusses the question of university organization and the general problem of student participation in university governance. The bulk of the section deals with different forms of student participation in governance, primarily at state universities. These arrangements include: students on the board of trustees, students on advisory committees, and students added to old and new legislative bodies. The second part is an annotated bibliography on the subject of governance. (ERIC) See also 45, 59, 60, 102.

62. Schwebel, Robert. "Waking Our Sleepy Universities: Student Involvement in Curriculum Change." Teachers College Record 70, October 1968, pp. 31-43.

This article describes specific examples of student involvement in producing curriculum changes both from within and outside the governmental structure. The author notes that the most widespread form of student involvement in educational policy making has been student attendance at meetings of curriculum and academic committees. (Shulman)

63. Wilson, Robert C. and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Voice--Faculty Response." The Research Reporter 4, 1969, pp. 1-4.

As part of a study of faculty characteristics and their influence on students, questionnaires covering a wide variety of faculty attitudes, values and behaviors were sent to over 1500 professors at six diverse colleges and universities. For this report, data were drawn from those collected on faculty attitudes toward student participation in campus governance. While the 1069 responding faculty were generally favorable toward student participation in the formulation of social rules and regulations, they were reluctant to share their academic power with students. Ninety-five professors thought that students should have an equal vote with the faculty on academic matters (equal vote group) and 41 others felt that students should have no role in the formulation of academic policy (no vote group). The remaining faculty fell between these two extremes. Both "extreme" groups were composed of committed and responsible teachers, but their responses to student participation in governance were found to be related to their educational philosophies, conceptions of and extra-academic contact with students, fields of study, political orientation, and involvement in campus affairs. The equal vote group had a liberal view of society and life and a positive view of students, and the no vote group was basically conservative and tended to believe that external control, motivation, and direction were needed in order for students to profit maximally from their education. (ERIC)

PART C. INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND GUIDELINES

64. Arkoff, Abe. "An Undergraduate Course in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 40, November 1969, pp. 643-648.

The author notes that a common criticism of student participation in governance of institutions of higher education is that students are often unfamiliar with the issues and problems of higher education. The author describes a course on higher education called "The College Experience Seminars" which was started in 1966 at the University of Hawaii to better prepare students for participating in policy-making decisions. (Wren) See also 67.

65. Auerbach, Carl. Memo to the Members of the University Faculty on the Subject of the Task Force Recommendations on Student Representation in the University Senate and Campus Assemblies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, February 24, 1969.

The Task Force on Student Representation of the University of Minnesota recommended that 75 student representatives be added as voting members of the University Senate, and that the 62 student senators from the Twin Cities campus also serve as voting members of the Twin Cities Assembly. The memorandum sets forth reasons why these constitutional changes should not be adopted and recommends some alternatives to the Task Force proposal. If the proposed changes were to be adopted, it is felt that there would be no organ of university government that would reflect the views of the faculty alone, and adoption plus university adherence to the one-man, one-vote principle would result in student control. It is believed that university government is best when it helps to accomplish the institution's missions of teaching, research, and public service. Therefore, university items of business could be divided into three categories: (1) those on which students alone should vote, (2) those on which students and faculty should have an equal vote, and (3) those on which faculty alone should vote. Also, students should have an opportunity to be heard on all items, even in cases where they may not vote. The memorandum contains lists of university matters that have been handled by the University Senate for the past ten years. It is felt that responsibility should be redistributed, and that increased decisions on student affairs by students would be desirable. (ERIC) See also 76, 101.

66. Benovich, Joseph B. Report of the President's Committee on Student Involvement in the University. Cleveland: Cleveland State University, May 16, 1969.

Originally established to consider expanded faculty and student involvement in the governance of Cleveland State University, the Committee decided to recommend changes within the existing governmental structure rather than encourage the establishment of a new system. Background material was studied, meetings were held, and two questionnaires were administered--one to deans, departmental chairmen and various other academic units at Cleveland State, and another to sixty-six universities asking for information on student involvement in governance at their institutions. The responses to the second questionnaire are tabulated.

All of the universities indicated they were "rethinking" or had recently revised their policies on student involvement in governance. Brief explanations of their reasons for doing so are offered. Recommendations of the committee call for student membership on seventeen university committees and representation at departmental meetings. Recommendations also include provisions for: the number of students to be included on each committee, method of selection, academic qualifications necessary and terms of appointment. (ERIC)

67. Clark, Freeman T. An Undergraduate Course in College and University Governance: Awareness of the Complexity of Institutions of Higher Education. Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association of Higher Education, Chicago, March 3, 1970.

An objection often raised against student participation in university governance is that students don't know enough about institutions of higher education. An undergraduate course that focuses on the functions and role of the university would help answer that objection. Such a course has been developed at the University of Michigan and includes the following topics: the historical, contemporary, and possible future functions of higher education in society; financing the university; the campus and the city; the campus as a mass society; the need for intermediate groups; rehumanizing the campus; the structure of organizations--functioning, internal dynamics and communication patterns; educational roles--faculty, students, and administration; classroom management; and simulation learning. In this way, students may learn not only about their own institution, but also about others. (ERIC) See also 64.

68. The Crow Report. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the Madison Campus. Madison: University of Wisconsin, February 6, 1968.

This committee report examines past student participation in the government of the University of Wisconsin, formulates principles concerning the role of students, and recommends structural and functional changes to achieve greater student participation. Except for the establishment of certain new committees, the report recommends changes within the existing governmental structure. The seventeen recommendations fall into four general categories which correspond to the guiding principles of the committee. First, the committee advocates complete withdrawal of all in loco parentis

activities by the University. Second, noting that student representation on practically all University committees was inadequate, the authors urge that committees review their structures and responsibilities with a view toward accommodating more student members. Third, students should be allowed to govern themselves to a greater extent. Faculty and administration supervision should be reduced and simpler means of communication between students and faculty should be developed. Finally, restructured and limited university disciplinary procedures are recommended. The committee urges no duplication of any civil law penalties by the University except in certain cases. Trials should be conducted by joint student-faculty panels with absolutely no administrative involvement. (ERIC)

69. Departmental Governance: Interim Report. Durham, N. C.: Duke University, May 29, 1970.

This report reviews the policy-making processes within departments at Duke University, as well as the relationships between departments and central administration on the one hand, and with students on the other hand. Specifically, the report examines and makes recommendations regarding: (1) the office of the departmental chairman, his selection, term of office, incentives, and powers; (2) faculty mechanisms of departmental governance; (3) mechanisms for student participation; undergraduate and graduate program committees and other methods of ensuring greater student participation; and (4) the composition of the Advisory Committee to the Dean of Faculty. A proposed statement on procedural standards regarding the renewal or non-renewal of faculty appointments by the American Association of University Professors, and a separate statement of views on student participation in departmental governance are included in the appendix. (ERIC)

70. "Governing a College: Whose Man is the Chancellor?" College Management 4, May 1969, pp. 56-60.

This article describes an attempt by the trustees of Syracuse University (New York) to involve students and faculty in the process of selecting a new chancellor. (Shulman) See also 78.

71. Knock, Gary H. and others. The Report of the Commission on Student Participation in University Life. Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, September 1969.

The Commission on Student Participation in University Life at Miami University examined many dimensions of

student life and university affairs with the objective of providing a framework within which a student may accept greater responsibility for the consequences of his own behavior and for planning his own future. In this statement, the Commission presents the basis for its investigation, offers a rationale for student participation in university life, and considers how such participation may be accomplished within the structure of Miami University. The discussion is presented with the Commission's recommendations under ten major headings: university governance, academic activities, student advising, communications within the university, freshman orientation, commuting students, black students at Miami University, women students at Miami University, residential activities, and extracurricular activities. Emphasis is placed on student involvement in policy-making. Separate recommendations and six appendices containing papers dealing with other subjects related to student participation in university life accompany the report. (ERIC)

72. Macneil, Ian. The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making: A Comment. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, August 29, 1969.

Based on the premise that intellectual liberty within a university must permeate the institution's teaching, scholarship, research, publications, relations with the outside world, internal operations and management, this comment is directed to individuals at Cornell University who do not understand the processes, restraints, and techniques that are required to preserve academic freedom. It focuses exclusively on relationships between student involvement in decision-making and intellectual liberty and suggests that before any significant change in the university is allowed to take place, the impact of such change on academic freedom should be considered. Increased student involvement in university decision-making, one such significant change that may have either beneficial or adverse effects on intellectual liberty, is discussed in the context of nonacademic matters, teaching, scholarship, and research. One complete section deals with the avoidance of activities that are inconsistent with the exercise of intellectual liberty. Another presents inherent differences between students and faculty, the most important of which are considered to be age, experience, permanency of relation to the university, degree of professionalization, numbers, and the difference between being a teacher and being taught. The author was a member of the President's Commission. (ERIC) See also 74, 77.

73. Magrath, C. Peter. "Student Participation: What Happens When We Try It?" The Future Academic Community. Edited by John Caffrey. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Because student participation in university governance is already a reality and will inevitably become more widespread, the task for American colleges and universities is to move toward more formal and institutionalized modes of student involvement. The experience of Brown Univeristy, which moved from essentially informal to formal student participation in making and enforcing rules regarding student conduct provides insight into the problems of structuring this change. There, an Advisory Committee on Student Conduct was appointed. It surveyed by questionnaire the attitudes of undergraduates, their parents, faculty and alumni toward conduct issues; canvassed procedures at a sample of other schools, took testimony from university officials and faculty and student organizations and individuals, and received numerous written communications. In the end, the Committee, consisting of faculty, student, and administration representatives, voted unanimously on 28 recommendations that were overwhelmingly endorsed by the faculty, students, trustees, and administrators. The recommendations were divided into those proposing new substantive rules and those proposing structural arrangements for making and enforcing future rules. In academic and curricular matters, students should have an advisory role, and channels should be established for the communication of their opinions. (ERIC) See also 15, 19.

74. Morison, Robert S. The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making: The Chairman's Report. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University, June 11, 1969.

This report is based on the premise that the principal functions of the modern university are teaching, research, and public service. The first section of the report briefly reviews these three functions and discusses: (1) the development of relationships between the university and society, particularly as this development has occurred in the United States; (2) the complex nature of university administration, and auxiliary but quasi-independent enterprises; and (3) reasons underlying student discontent and how they are related to the quality of a student's life as a member of the university community, to the quality of his educational experience, and to his relationships to the university as a concerned citizen. The second

section of the report recommends administrative changes that could be undertaken for the distribution of institutional government within the existing framework of Cornell University in particular and at any university in general. This discussion covers Cornell University's academic matters and educational environment as they relate to student development; the need for a new administrative device for dealing with major policy issues; and fundamental issues concerning the university's relationship to U. S. national policy. (ERIC) See also 72, 77.

75. Report of the Task Force on Student Participation in Campus Governance. Berkeley: University of California (Office of the President), December 29, 1969.

This report to the California legislature outlines in broad terms the role students should play in governance on the different campuses of the state university. The report upholds three "major guidelines." (1) Student leadership should dominate in matters concerning student life on campus, with participation of administration and faculty. (2) Faculty leadership should dominate in the area of academic decision making, with student and administration involvement. (3) In areas where the administration must take the lead, the roles of students and faculty have to be carefully considered. Recommendations are made which discuss: student involvement in decision making on departmental, college and school, and campus-wide administrative levels; the role of the Academic Senate; greater effectiveness of student government; and the need for a mechanism to facilitate campus-wide communication. The mode of implementation is left to the individual campuses. (Shulman)

76. Report of the University of Minnesota Task Force on Student Representation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, January 2, 1969.

In May 1968, the President of the University of Minnesota appointed a task force to study the question of student representation in the University Senate and in individual campus assemblies, and to explore ways in which students might be elected to serve. The task force noted that although students were well represented on many committees, the University Senate remained largely a faculty body. It recommended incorporation of students as full participants in the Senate and Assemblies and increased student membership in Senate and Assembly Committees. Specific recommendations

were made regarding: the constituencies, election, term of office, and eligibility of student Senators; the number of students on various Senate committees and their selection and election; student Assemblymen; the number of students on various Assembly committees and their selection. (ERIC) See also 65, 101.

77. Sindler, Allan P. "A Case Study in Student-University Relations." The Future Academic Community. Edited by John Caffrey. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Much of the outcome of the students' desire to direct their lives on and off campus, to shape university policy, and to involve themselves in controversial public issues will depend on the insight of faculties and administrations. Responding to the pressing issue of University principles and practices in regulating student misconduct, Cornell established a University Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local, State and Federal Law. The Commission comprised roughly equal proportions of administration, faculty, and students, and was given a broad mandate to write a report dealing with all aspects of student affairs, judicial procedures, artistic freedom, freedom of expression, and to include policy recommendations delineating the appropriate role of the University in each sector. Endorsed by all Commission members, the Report was widely disseminated on campus and in the community. Stemming from the Report were a University Statement of Principles and Policies Governing Student Misconduct, and legislation (largely consistent with the Report) altering the University's adjudicative structure for handling misconduct. Although student ferment and dissatisfaction provoked the re-evaluation of policies, there was surprisingly little student reaction to the Report. This was probably because of general agreement with its findings and suggestions and, more importantly, because the students realized they had become effective and desired participants in the University's administrative processes. (ERIC) See also 72, 74.

78. Splete, Allen P. An Interim Report on Student Representation in the Academic Community at Syracuse University. New York: Syracuse University, May 1969.

This report documents and describes the substantial student representation at the all-University, college or school, and departmental levels of Syracuse University. It notes that 25 students are members of six major policy-making committees, that 17 graduate and 28 undergraduate students will become members of the

University Senate in Fall 1969, and that eleven students were members of the 33-member Selection Committee for a New Chancellor. "These are major changes at Syracuse and I think we will find other schools seeking to broaden avenues of student participation in a similar manner." The Bylaws of the Senate as amended on December 17, 1969 are included. They describe the Senate's membership and the functions of its committees. (ERIC) See also 70.

79. Student Involvement: A Bri[illegible] to Total Education: Revised Edition. Raleigh, N. C.: North Carolina State Board of Education, January 1971.

This report recommends to administrators and students ways of opening channels through which students can express their opinions about administrative decisions and assume greater responsibility for solving their educational problems. The recommendations cover general administrative policies, attitudes and actions of administrators, attitudes and actions of students, extracurricular activities, student councils, human relations, hypersensitive areas (such as student elections for cheerleaders and activity queens), and curriculum. (ERIC)

80. Student Involvement in Tenure Decisions. Salt Lake City: Utah University, March 3, 1969.

The principal justification for granting faculty members academic tenure has historically been associated with the idea of academic freedom and economic security. However, tenure at the same time may also tend to perpetuate mediocrity and incompetence within a college community if faculty members are not carefully scrutinized prior to granting them tenure. Students, because of their close association with faculty, should definitely be included in the evaluation of teacher competence. Thus, it is recommended that the University of Utah create a Student Advisory Committee comprised of upperclassmen and graduate students in each department to make recommendations regarding curriculum or other departmental changes, and evaluations of all teachers being considered for retention or tenure. It is also recommended that three qualified students be granted membership on the University Tenure Advisory Committee. Their role would be to ensure that student concerns and opinion are considered by the committee in reaching their decisions. (ERIC)

81. The Student Role in Governance. Olympia: Washington State Legislature, Joint Committee on Higher Education, January 1973.

This document presents the results of a study made by the Joint Committee on Higher Education on the systems of governance at institutions of higher education in Washington State. The study directs particular attention to the role and function of students and their organizations in the governance process. The main conclusion of this report is that students should be an integral part of governance organizations and should have ample opportunity to discuss their views on governance within the higher education community. The legislative proposal made is directed toward insuring student involvement in decisions regarding the uses of the student services and activities fee. (ERIC)

SECTION II. CAMPUS AND INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

PART A. THEORY, MODELS, AND OPINION

82. Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

This article rejects both the bureaucratic and collegial models of university governance to describe the real processes of decision making. The author attempts to show that governance is a "political" process in which various academic interest groups interact as they try to shape the destiny of the university. A campus political system can be divided into three components: (1) a complex social structure that generates many forms of power and multiple pressures that impinge on decision makers, (2) a legislative stage that translates these pressures into policy, and (3) a policy implementation phase that generates feedback with the potential for new conflicts. (Wren)

83. Bowen, Howard. "Governance and Educational Reform." In Agony and Promise. Edited by G. Kerry Smith, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

The author views governance primarily as a means to achieving the educational goals of the university, one of which, he notes, is to remain educationally progressive. He suggests that governance is the mechanism needed to achieve academic reform and that a coalition of students and administrators is needed to work with the faculty to achieve change. Bowen proposes a new governing structure with independent constituencies to replace the old legislative structures. His plan is to create a joint council representing the interests of the entire university, not the goals of various interest groups. Final authority and accountability would rest with the president, who would work cooperatively with such a council. (Wren)

84. Corson, John. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

This book, although a decade old, has become one of the standard works on college administration. Corson sees governance as the task of establishing rules and making the succession of decisions that are required to relate and order various subdivisions which will make them productive. The study, based on Corson's

observations of fifteen colleges and universities of various types, is essentially descriptive. He describes the roles of the university-wide officers, the academic officers, the faculty, and the departments. He does, however, pose questions for further study and discussion at the end of most chapters. (Shulman)

85. Corson, John. "New Developments in Campus Governance." In New Teaching, New Learning. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

The author outlines five major proposals for modifying the structure of college and university governance and urges their consideration. They are: (1) that new mechanisms be developed which make possible community-wide participation; (2) that the redistribution of authority be made explicit; (3) that leadership (administrative) be strengthened; (4) that every extension of authority include a means to enforce accountability; and (5) that the traditional structure of colleges and universities be modified. The author's main contention is that governance can no longer be founded on a structure which relies on authority to command. What must be designed is a system of governance which is able to create consent. (Wren)

86. Elliot, Lloyd H. "Changing Internal Structures: The Relevance of Democracy." In The Future Academic Community. Edited by John Caffrey. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Because the scene of the struggle to control men's minds has shifted from other battlefields to the university, the university must reappraise its role and responsibilities as a democratic institution within a democracy. The important question is not "who shall govern the university" but "for what end shall the university be governed." Procedures must be established to nurture the pursuit of truth in the academic program, the most fundamental work of the university. Institutional reform may be approached in two major ways. One is to create a departmental advisory body comprised of professors, students, alumni, and the public. Its duty would be to formulate recommendations for change in the academic program which would then be presented to the department chairman and faculty. A byproduct of this arrangement would be increased communication among constituencies as new and closer working relationships were established. The second area of reform involves the toal abolishment of the concept of "in loco parentis." Academic freedom must be firmly upheld so that

all voices may be heard. Participation in governance calls for objectivity and personal responsibility, for the effectiveness of the institutional structure will depend on the extent to which individuals can accommodate themselves to the university and its goals. (ERIC)

87. Gustad, John W. "Community, Consensus and Conflict." Educational Record 47, Fall 1966, pp. 439-451.

The author believes that the rapid pace of change in higher education is uprooting old patterns and well-established roles, and that the major obstacle in this new environment is role conflict. Gustad argues that within each campus constituency several differing reference groups exist with goals which often conflict; only if these goals can be identified and clarified can effective leadership emerge. This leadership would be capable of achieving consensus among the constituencies. Conflict will undoubtedly still exist, but what is urgently needed is an atmosphere of openness to stimulate creative dialogue. Finally, the author suggests that inquiry be directed toward the conditions for change so that it can be effected without waiting for crisis situations. (Wren)

88. Hallberg, Edmond C. "An Academic Congress: A Direction in University Governance." Phi Delta Kappan 50, May 1969, pp. 538-540.

The author believes that students can and should participate in college and university governance. He proposes that a governmental form grow out of the mutual needs and purposes expressed by those governed. This long proposed concept is impossible to realize under the present system of governance. The author sees three governmental alternatives for the future: (1) students will find a place as "necessary" representatives in faculty governance as it now exists; (2) each power group will retain a separate organization and vie for power; or (3) an all-college government will be formed. The author advocates and discusses the third possibility. (Shulman)

89. Henderson, Algo. "Effective Models of University Governance." In Search for Leaders: Current Issues in Higher Education. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

The author discusses three models of university governance: (1) a vertical hierarchy of power and authority,

(2) an entity to mediate among subgroups, and (3) a forum for group participation in decision making. The author argues against the hierarchy model because it does not harmonize with the objectives or nature of educational institutions; and against the model of mediation which leads to confrontation tactics that tend to disunify the institution, and which emphasizes working conditions rather than educational goals. He supports the model for group participation because it best takes into account the complexity of individual and group interests in the university. Moreover, this model provides an orderly pattern for involvement of people in relation to their ability to contribute. (Wren)

90. Hodgkinson, Harold L. and Meeth, Richard. Power and Authority: Transformation of Campus Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

This book consists of ten articles dealing with many levels of campus governance. Three of the articles--those by Brewster, Powell, and Johnston--bear directly on the subject of student participation in campus governance. Kingman Brewster believes governance reform needs to focus on accountability rather than on representation. Robert Powell thinks student power is fundamentally an educational principle, not a political one. He advocates a more democratic institution, with less faculty domination of academic decisions. Robert Johnston argues that the thrust of student concern has been for personal freedom and a more egalitarian society. He believes students seek to rework the structures of power and authority, to decentralize them, and to bring them closer to the people they affect. The remaining articles treat student participation in more peripheral ways, but nevertheless include important viewpoints on the subject. (Wren)

91. Jenks, R. Stephen. "An Internal Change Agent's Role in Restructuring University Governance." Journal of Higher Education 44, May 1973, pp. 370-379.

The author describes the change in the University of New Hampshire's governance structure from a faculty-administration body with a parallel student senate to a unicameral university senate with equal faculty and student representation, and assesses the structure after it has been in operation for four years. He outlines six principles for bringing about change: (1) take on the right task, (2) do your homework, (3) be open, (4) stick to important basics, (5) be an

advocate, and (6) don't work uphill. The author concludes that discussion and agreement among members on processes for distributing work, decision making, and managing conflict are critical to the success of any committee. (Wren) See also 101, 128, 131, 132.

92. Martin, Warren B. Governance--For What? Paper presented at Conference of Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities, 1970.

This paper poses the question: What goals is governance designed to further? The author divides the question into three dimensions: (1) What will be the social and political environment in which it operates? (2) What will be the values served or objectives sought? and (3) What will be the effect of the type of governance for society and for institutional goals? The author sees a major social struggle developing over the control of educational institutions. Thus, the governance model which is adopted will figure significantly in the outcome of this struggle. The author advocates that institutions move away from the hierarchical-authoritarian model toward the egalitarian-participatory model. The latter, he notes, is more consistent with the need for pluralism and process, and is the best way to be responsive to external forces without succumbing to them. (Wren)

93. Martin, Warren B. "The University as Community." Educational Record 48, Fall 1967, pp. 320-326.

The author believes that the modern university is divided and indecisive because it is still trying to follow a social consensus which no longer exists. This indecisive character does not arise from disagreement over its essential nature: collective opinion regards service as the central function of the university; differences of opinion arise over what forms its service shall take and what priorities it will establish. Rather than attempt to define its service mission from the viewpoint of a society in conflict, the university must become a center of service as determined by the academic community itself. The author argues that, despite divergences, the various groups in academe do have enough in common to provide the basis for meaningful community, and it can be achieved without sacrificing diversity. While universities are large, complex organizations, it is important for the individual to relate to a group small enough to be affected by his/her presence. Thus, within the larger organization, smaller "life-core" units need to be provided. The

author advocates the structuring of the university into undergraduate colleges, each with not more than 500-800 students. Each college should have enough autonomy to establish its own curriculum and special character. Governance would be conducted by college councils composed of students, faculty, and administrators. The author concludes by noting that in a true community, interest groups prosper, but their aspirations to power are checked. Educational institutions should not be dominated by any single constituency; rather, each one has something unique and significant to contribute, and community makes possible the contribution of all. (Wren)

94. Mortimer, Kenneth P. Forms of Campus Governance: Joint Participation, Separate Jurisdictions and Collective Bargaining. Speech presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges, San Francisco, January 16, 1973.

This paper discusses three major statements on shared authority and points out that there appear to be three types: joint participation in decision making, separate jurisdictions, and collective bargaining. Academic senates and campus councils are the major manifestations of the first two types and a brief discussion of the state and their evolution is provided. A major section of the paper deals with collective bargaining as a governance mechanism. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the directions in which governance reforms appear to be heading. A 16-item bibliography is included. (ERIC)

95. O'Neil, Robert M. "Paradoxes of Campus Power." In New Teaching, New Learning. Edited by G. Kerry Smith, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

This article explores some of the paradoxes in the governance of higher education and presents some tentative recommendations for designing the process. Five paradoxes are discussed: minimal change, disappearing power, unselectivity, redistribution of power, and formalism. The author notes that in view of these paradoxes, the student of governance must be a supreme realist. He suggests several approaches to reform within this context: (1) concentrate upon one institution, (2) study the functional aspects of governance as opposed to structural ones, (3) appraise the claims of each constituency for participation, (4) consider governance options within a selective grid of particular claims and tasks, and (5) keep in mind the independence

of various forces. The author concludes by noting that the growth of external pressures on educational institutions makes study and reform of internal decision making especially urgent. (Wren)

96. Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Governance Theory: A Comparison of Approaches." Journal of Higher Education 45, May 1974, pp. 344-354.

This article explores two traditional models of governance, the bureaucratic and the collegial, and discusses the political model as the most recent development in internal governance. The author notes that the bureaucratic model has been most applicable to administrative decision making in higher education. The collegial model has two major versions--the separate jurisdictions approach and the more modern version of shared authority or joint participation. Under separate jurisdictions, it was assumed that each constituency was concerned about different issues and would respect the boundaries between their separate jurisdictions. The joint participation approach was an attempt to update this notion, realizing that interests and competencies could not be rigidly established. The author believes, however, that neither the bureaucratic nor the collegial model by itself can work successfully to resolve serious conflict, due to the limitations of each. He suggests that both of these models, as well as the political one, offer significant insights into organizational processes; and none of the three should be seen as mutually exclusive, since each focuses on a different aspect of institutional life. (Wren)

97. Schimmel, David. "Conditional Decision-Making: An Alternative to the Committee Octopus." Journal of Higher Education 43, February 1972, pp. 85-96.

The values of participation and efficiency in decision making frequently compete with one another in debate over campus governance. The structure which has developed to accommodate both values has been the committee system. But the current trend toward greater participation has resulted in more committees dealing with a larger number of issues, many parallel and overlapping committees, and a minimum of coordination and communication among the committees. The author argues that the results do not justify the great amount of time and resources committed. The committee system, he says, is ineffective and is built on the assumption that participation is an end in itself. It also implies a belief that more participation will result in better decisions,

a notion the author disputes. He argues that an approach can be found which would protect the rights of students and faculty to participate in issues of major importance and at the same time cut the costs of decision making. This system is called "conditional decision making." Under this system each issue that would normally be referred to a committee would be conditionally decided by an administrator. A copy of the decision and the reasons for making it would be issued to all affected faculty and students. If ten percent of the faculty and students did not register their objections within ten days, it would become final; if sufficient objection were registered, the issue would then be referred to the regular committee system. The author presents seven premises and arguments to support his proposal. Variations of the proposal are presented which would allow institutions to pursue limited experimentation with such a process. (Wren)

98. Who's in Charge? Special Report by Editorial Projects for Education, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland, 1969.

This short report outlines the roles and problems of college trustees, presidents, faculty and students in governing their institutions. The main topic discussed is the burgeoning power of students and the differing aims of some of the major student organizations. The article emphasizes that factions must find ways to work together as a community to preserve academic freedom and avoid the total destruction of the university. The influences of the public, the alumni, and the federal government are considered. The report notes that increasing numbers of institutions have devised or are seeking ways to make students an integral part of the campus decision-making process. It includes some suggestions of President Kingman Brewster (Yale University) for peaceful student involvement. (ERIC)

99. Wilson, Logan. "Changing University Governance." Educational Record 50, Fall 1969, pp. 388-404.

The author notes that many institutions have established or are studying governance reform. But he believes that five basic questions must be addressed before an institution restructures its governance system: (1) Who now decides what? (2) Which facets of governance are sources of dissatisfaction and for whom? (3) What changes are being proposed and why? (4) How can their feasibility and desirability be assessed? and (5) What are the implications of the proposed changes? The author explores these questions and concludes that the university must

maintain some governance system to give it coherence and proper direction, and that for the rule of reason rather than force to prevail, authority must be rational. He says that, if academic governance is regarded as a mechanism for problem solving, the alternative modes of decision making should be judged by the results they can produce. The author argues that nothing in the realm of governance is sacrosanct, and that the redistribution of campus power and authority is a means to--not an end of--the educational enterprise. However, participants should remember that colleges and universities are created and maintained for the good of the larger society, not just for the benefit of those directly connected with them. Thus, the main institutional concern in the long run must be the "public interest." (Wren)

PART B. RESEARCH ON DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

100. Chickering, Arthur W. "Communications--Bedrock for College Governance." Educational Record 5, Spring 1970, pp. 148-153.

A survey of thirteen small colleges indicated that there was limited communication between students and faculty outside class and limited thought and exchange of ideas in class despite the fact that American undergraduates today are better prepared, more complex, more sophisticated, and more autonomous than ever before. These students need frequent opportunities for communication, open debate and widespread involvement, but these conditions do not prevail at most colleges and universities. Exchange increases and the dimension of discussion expands only when students perceive teaching and curriculum as relevant to their concerns and backgrounds. Outside the classroom, student-faculty relationships should be based on accessibility, authenticity, honesty, knowledge, understanding, and the ability to talk with, not at each other. The report recommends that campuses redirect energies toward achieving these goals. A 15-page study of college dropouts is appended. (ERIC)

101. Dill, David D. Case Studies in University Governance. Washington: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1971.

This book is a detailed examination of four examples of new forms of university governance. It examines

governance at the all-university level and focuses on process rather than on structure. The institutions were Florida A & M University, the University of Minnesota, Columbia University, and the University of New Hampshire. Each institution had piloted a new form of governance and the bulk of each case study is concerned with selected aspects of the new system in operation. (Wren) See also 65, 76, 91, 120, 128, 131, 132, 137, 138.

102. Hodgkinson, Harold L. Campus Governance: The Amazing Thing Is That It Works at All. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington: Office of Education, July 1971.

This paper reviews the literature on governance from 1965 to 1970. The author surveys the attitudes of those who participate in the governing process--students, faculty, administration--and illustrates how patterns of governance are undergoing change. Several innovative governance models are given along with a review of related problems, such as accountability, decentralization, versus centralization, who should be represented, and the influence of forces outside the educational community. Topics for futher research are recommended and an extensive bibliography concludes the report. (ERIC) See also 45, 59, 60, 61.

103. Hodgkinson, Harold L. "The Next Decade." The Research Reporter 5, 1970.

In our society, the majority of the population is under 25, and the value orientation of this group is replacing the old one of the Protestant Ethic. Work is deemphasized and fulfillment stressed; joy is substituted for guilt. The campus has, however, not moved an iota toward this new ethic, and much of student protest revolves around that. During the next decade, the number of adversary situations in governance will probably increase and factional struggles for power and control of the university may ruin it. The great public institutions which enroll an ever greater number of students have reported significant increases in student unrest, and because of their size, will continue to be vulnerable to disruption. Existing institutions must be selectively decentralized so that their governance systems be both small and large simultaneously: decisions affecting individual lives and commitments should be made in the smallest possible units, while matters of logistics and support services should be decided in the largest context available, tapping into national networks. (ERIC)

104. Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Who Decides Who Decides?" In Agony and Promise. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

In several projects, the Center is studying the question: who will decide which factions will be represented in the decision-making process? In the Campus Governance Project investigating the nature of governance, over 3,000 questionnaires were administered and 900 intensive interviews conducted at 19 institutions. The questionnaire was designed to identify problems of governance and determine which individuals were considered knowledgeable and influential in dealing with them and how they became so. It was generally found that today's governance is more complex, more involved with negotiated exchange among many internal and external factions than before. Presidents retain accountability for all that happens on their campus though their ability to control it has declined. Patterns are hard to change because: most academicians believe that practices adopted by other institutions are inappropriate to their own; most change occurs by accretion; self-interest rather than concern for the institution dominates decision making. Major sources of friction are the budget and distribution of information regarding it, delegation of authority, and the method of announcing decisions (particularly bad news). Extreme resentment was expressed against state education departments, presidents and deans of students. Among a number of suggestions for improving governance, the most widely adopted is that of a campuswide governing body composed of representatives from all factions. Despite complaints, however, changes might provoke even greater dissatisfaction. (ERIC)

105. Keeton, Morris. "The Disenfranchised on Campus." In The Troubled Campus. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

The author recommends three changes in campus governance to reduce disenfranchisement: (1) a realignment of authority among campus constituencies, (2) a stress upon communications rooted in the legitimation of differing perspectives, and (3) the decentralization of structures and processes of management to foster collaborative self-government. The author does not imply that using a collaborative style of authority sharing will put an end to conflict, but rather that conflict would be resolved out of a determination to work together toward joint achievements. (Wren)

106. Keeton, Morris and others. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

This book was the result of an extensive campus governance project sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education. The data were collected from nineteen campuses selected for their diversity of control, programs, size, etc. The authors make recommendations on two subjects: (1) who should have prerogatives in governing, and (2) on what grounds and how these prerogatives should be exercised. They conclude that authority should be more widely shared on campuses, and they outline processes of consent, accountability, and leadership which would enable participants to exercise their authority more responsibly and effectively. (Wren)

107. Lee, Eugene C. and Bowen, Frank M. The Multi-Campus University. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

This study, undertaken in 1968-69, was sponsored by the Carnegie Commission. It represents an in-depth analysis of the governance of the modern multi-campus university, focusing on nine multi-campus institutions, including the University of California. The authors consider the environment, structure, and processes of governance, and examine some major problems, trends, and issues facing the multi-campus university in the 1970's and beyond. They also examine the state of student organization and the administration of student affairs at the system-wide level. (Wren)

108. Locklin, Ralph H. and Steward, Clifford T. Student, Faculty, and Administrator Perceptions of Decision-Making at Four Colleges. Paper presented at the Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March 1970.

This study reports an attempt to look at differences between the views of students and "faculty-administration." The study also sought to determine whether each group was misunderstanding the amount of control desired by the other group. To investigate the problem, questionnaires containing questions about 38 campus issues were distributed to a sampling of students, faculty, and administrators at four different types of institutions in the West. Respondents were asked to indicate how decisions should be made regarding either policy formulation or rules and regulations in each of the areas. In addition, students and faculty-administrators reported their perceptions on the degree of control desired by

each other. Responses indicated that the students wanted more control over decision making than faculty-administration found desirable. Misunderstandings of the desires of the other group complicated the situation and led to intensification of problems. There were many issues, especially those related to individual student behavior, in which dominant norms in student desires did not exist. Faculty-administration responses were varied on most items. (ERIC)

109. Shulman, Carol. Governance: Compendium Series of Current Research, Programs and Proposals, No. 1. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

This compendium lists and describes 61 ongoing or recently completed studies and programs dealing with college and university governance. Items are listed alphabetically by title and include beginning and expected dates of completion, principal investigator, source of availability and source of funding. An introductory essay discusses trends in governance research and identifies major topics under investigation: (1) student participation; (2) faculty role; (3) trustee responsibility; (4) institutional goals and planning; and (5) administration problems. Indexes of authors, institutions, and sponsoring agencies are included. (ERIC)

PART C. INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND PRACTICES

110. The Assembly on University Goals and Governance. A First Report. Sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, 1970.

This report proposed 85 theses covering the roles and responsibilities of higher education. Of the 85, three of the theses concerned student participation in governance: (1) Colleges and universities should reexamine their support of extracurricular activities. Students are increasingly adult, and if they are to be independent, they should choose the activities they wish to maintain; (2) Many activities in addition to extracurricular ones might be delegated to students (e.g., housing). Some functions might be performed better by students than by others; (3) Student government is a misnomer; it rarely governs, though it often provides a forum where student views are heard. Involvement of

students in decentralized schools and departments should be fostered because the greatest possibility of student influence on educational policy occurs there. (Wren)

111. Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Chapter 1 of this report on campus unrest examines the nature of the crisis: the kinds of institutions where violence is most likely to occur; the issues that gave rise to protest including generational conflict, the social "irrelevance" of youth, obsolete educational practices, the breakdown of authority, and social malaise; and institutional reactions to this unrest. Chapter 2 discusses: (1) what's troubling the students--experiences of indifference and neglect, political impotence, lack of information, disciplinary or policy action, discrimination, bad teaching, etc.; (2) what's troubling the faculty--governance, departmental functioning, academic questions, relations with students, and university goals; (3) what's troubling administrators--faculty, financial problems, communication, governance, institutional goals, and student unrest; and (4) what's troubling the trustees--finances, the faculty and teaching, governance, student unrest, institutional goals and societal relations, and institutional leadership. Chapter 3 contains recommendations regarding the roles and responsibilities of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees. Statistical tables on campus unrest, 1968-69, are included at the end of the report. (ERIC)

112. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, April 1973.

The Commission's report and recommendations concerned: (1) adequate provision for institutional independence, (2) the role of the board of trustees and of the president, (3) collective bargaining by the faculty, (4) rules and practice governing tenure, (5) student influence on campus, and (6) handling emergencies. The Commission defines governance as the structures and the processes of decision making, and thus distinguishes governance from administration and management. It recommends increased student participation within the limits of their interest, competence, and ability to take responsibility. The Commission recommends that in these areas students should serve on joint committees with faculty and/or administrators and should have the right to vote. The report also notes that some of the most valuable contributions of student participation

can be at the departmental level. Finally, it emphasizes the educational value of such participation. The Commission's report includes a number of useful appendices which summarize other major reports on student participation in the governance of higher education. (Wren)

113. The Challenge to the University. Dissenting Report. Study Commission on University Governance. Berkeley: University of California, April 4, 1968.

See also 114.

114. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. Report of the Study Commission on University Governance. Berkeley: University of California, January 1968.

This book is the complete official report of the faculty-student Study Commission on University Governance appointed in January, 1967 by the Berkeley Academic Senate and the Senate of Associated Students. Although the book is concerned with total university governance, it is especially concerned with increasing effective student participation. Governance is discussed primarily from the standpoint of the University of California, Berkeley campus. Chapter VI deals primarily with the rationale for student participation and gives specific consideration to the areas of education policy making, conduct, and welfare services. General goals rather than specific recommendations are offered. (Shulman)
See also 113.

115. The Governance of The George Washington University. Report of the Commission on Governance of the University. Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, May 1971.

Charged with examining "responsibility, authority, and decision making" within The George Washington University, the Commission first explored the impact of modernization on governance. Chapter I of its report discusses the topic and summarizes major recommendations. Chapter II deals with participation in the academic community and discusses the appropriate role of students, faculty trustees, administrators, and others. Chapter III discusses self-discipline with relation to the student body and the faculty. Chapter IV contains guidelines for informal and formal channels of communication within the University. Chapter V describes the present status of the University's fiscal management and suggests changes in planning and programming functions. Appendix

A details a proposed Office of Planning and Budget. (ERIC)

116. Government of Colleges and Universities. Statement of American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1966.

This report notes that the variety and complexity of tasks performed by higher education produces an inescapable interdependence among its constituencies. This relationship necessitates communication and opportunities for joint planning between constituencies. The report recommends that ways be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. It cites certain obstacles, but presents four rights essential for student involvement: (1) the right to speak in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal, (2) the right to discuss questions of institutional policy, (3) the right to academic due process, and (4) the right to hear speakers of their own choice. (Wren) See also 42, 119.

117. "Government of the University." In The Study of Education at Stanford: Report to the University. Stanford: Stanford University, February 1969.

This report, the tenth and last of a series, is presented by the Steering Committee, the Study of Education at Stanford. The series, based on the concept that education should be a continuous process of discovery throughout life, sets forth recommendations for strengthening the academic enterprise at Stanford University. In this report, the Committee on Government of the University's recommendations focus on those aspects of university governance for which certain specific changes might afford some promise of marked administrative improvement. The recommendations cover the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, the roles of the president and other principal administrative officers, school and departmental administrators, university-wide faculty committees, and student participation in faculty committees. Also proposed are certain responsibilities for officers who oversee the academic aspects of undergraduate life at Stanford and a Dean of Graduate Studies who would be responsible for the management of graduate education. (ERIC)

118. Issues in University Governance. A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1968.

The colloquium on issues in university governance was organized to identify and define major governmental issues facing U. S. colleges and universities and, following an interdisciplinary analysis of the issues, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken. Explanations that emerged as to why the governance of academic institutions has become an increasing source of debate were the inadequate adaptation of U.S. college and university structures to social change, the loss of academic institutions' protective coat of isolation as they are drawn into the mainstream of U.S. life, the drastic shift of the institutional balance of power, the loss of college students' bargaining power in influencing policies at their institutions, and the changes in U.S. society and their influence on students of the late 1960's. It was also agreed that problems exist in university financing, curricular planning, institutional efficiency, and the adjudicating of differences of opinion about institutional purposes and roles. Two serious problems must be resolved in order to lessen the conflict over governance: inadequate analysis of the problems of governance, and insufficient understanding or knowledge of the data that exist on these problems. The recommendations in the report focus on these two problems. Summaries of the general sessions of the colloquium are appended. (ERIC)

119. Proposed Alterations in the Governance of the University. Stanford: American Association of University Professors, Stanford University Chapter, October 3, 1968.

The introduction reads: "We are dissatisfied with the style or manner of administration at Stanford. Hitherto the faculty and students have had insufficent information to discuss University policies effectively. Information that has been provided has come too little and too late. Our goal is for greater participation in setting University policy and not just ratifying it. Hence numerous recommendations ask for a greater quantity of timely information relevant to major decisions and urge increased faculty and student participation in the decision-making process." The resolutions, which are accompanied by discussion and which were accepted by the Stanford chapter of the A.A.U.P. deal with: the Board of Trustees, appointment of administrative officers, discussion of University issues, faculty and student

participation in decision making, the student role in governance, crisis handling, financial matters, protection of personal privacy, and the implications for the university of external social pressures. (ERIC) See also 42, 116.

120. Statement on Student, Faculty, Administrative Relationships. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Washington, D. C.: NASULGC, November, 1969.

The purpose of this report was to provide a perspective for institutional self-assessment of current governance models. The report does not prescribe specific solutions, but rather attempts to give a fuller understanding of the problems which will allow explorations on campuses to be more sensitive and fruitful. The report sketches the historical background and modern context of governance and includes some theoretical and practical considerations to reform. Several models of university government are developed, including the academic community, the independent constituency, and the city council model. (Wren) See also 101.

121. Toward Community in University Government. Report of the Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1970.

This is an in-depth report examining the structure of the University of Toronto. The Commission establishes a philosophical claim that the University is still a community. But it was convinced that the definitions of purpose of the past could not unify a community today. The Commission thus attempted to formulate clear principles and structures for a new community. It recommended that governing bodies known as Councils be established for each department, center, and institute. These Councils would make policy on personnel, curriculum, budgets, research and consulting, short- and long-range planning, teaching methods, and other appropriate matters. Membership on Councils would be elective--consisting of two-fifths academic staff, two-fifths students, and one-fifth administrators. (Wren)

SECTION III. BROADLY-BASED DECISION-MAKING BODIES

122. Allan, George. Summary Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Governance. Carlisle, Pa.: Dickinson College, May 1971.

These proposals for the reformation of Dickinson College's governmental structure are the result of three years of study and debate by a single committee of students and faculty, with shifting membership. Part I reproduces the initial recommendations for a bicameral legislature combined with a strong College Cabinet. Flow charts illustrate the text. Part II presents resolutions for the establishment of All-College committees to replace parallel faculty and student committees. Following rejection of the College Cabinet and bicameral legislature, new proposals for a College Senate were submitted. The proposals and a summary of the committee's reasoning appear in Part III. Part IV contains a proposal for an All-College Committee on Personnel, which was rejected by the faculty in favor of an All-Faculty Committee. (ERIC) See also 139.

123. Babbidge, Jr., Homer D. Eighth Annual Faculty Convocation. Storrs: University of Connecticut, November 6, 1969.

In this address, the President of the University of Connecticut reviews a number of important issues on his campus. He discusses a recent "separatist" move of the Student Senate to assume control of the dormitories. "The alternative to student separation is, of course, more effective and powerful student participation in some form of community government, based on a recognition of common interests and the legitimacy of each one's interest in the affairs of all." Rejecting the notion of a separate student government, he urges adoption of a unicameral governing body and a major overhaul of the existing governmental structure to make it more responsive to members of the academic community. He argues that the people of Connecticut (because they "have paid for and own all of our academic facilities") deserve to participate in designing a charter or constitution for the University. He suggests that a constitutional convention be convened and that, later, the Board of Trustees assume the role of supreme court charged with ensuring that the actions of everyone involved in institutional legislative or executive policy are in accordance with the constitution. (Shulman)

124. Blair, Carolyn L. All-College Council at Maryville College. Maryville, Tenn.: Maryville College, 1969.

In May 1968, the Special Committee on Community Life and Structure of Maryville College recommended that an All-College Council be organized by January 1969. Following approval of this recommendation by the Executive Council of the Faculty, the Special Committee proposed the nomination of fifteen council members who were subsequently chosen in a campus wide election. The members comprised six students from the three upper classes; six faculty members from three groups chosen on the basis of tenure; and six administrative officers from those whose position, in the judgment of the administrative staff, would make them most useful on the Council. The President, Academic Dean, and Secretary of the Faculty would be automatic members. In January 1969, the 18-member All-College Council was installed as the chief deliberative and legislative body for Maryville College. It is responsible for long-range planning and for directing the activities of the entire college community, under the broad purposes and policies set forth by the College's Board of Directors. The three coordinating councils that supplement the Council are responsible for activities in academic, religious, social, cultural and recreational affairs. Smaller committees within the coordinating councils will direct specific programs. (ERIC)

125. Committee on University Governance Report to the Regents of the University of New Mexico. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, May 1971.

The Committee on University Governance was charged with the responsibility of conducting a new study of the University of New Mexico's governance and to recommend improvements. This report contains a discussion and recommendations relating to: (1) the creation of a University Community Council, including its functions, size, and composition; (2) the need for a student voice in matters of curriculum and quality of instruction; (3) faculty organization; (4) the creation of the position of University Ombudsman; and (5) grievance and disciplinary procedures. Included in the appendices are: (1) examples of statements which might be used in the Regents' Statement on Rights; (2) a model Bill of Rights and Responsibilities; and (3) the Harvard Resolution on Rights and Responsibilities. (ERIC)

126. Constitution of the Yeshiva College Senate. New York: Yeshiva College, 1969.

According to the preamble to its new constitution, the Yeshiva College Senate will "share responsibility for the operations and improvement of the College among the groups that constitute the College." The Senate is to be composed of five administrators, eight faculty members, six students and one nonvoting alumnus. Article I details their selection, terms of office, and procedural matters. Article II delineates the Senate's scope. It is to have jurisdiction over: academic standards; admissions policy; curriculum; degree requirements; the establishment of new majors and courses; policy determination in the areas of standards of scholastic performance, student attendance, the grading system and academic honors; and disposition of all matters submitted to it by the administration, faculty and student council. In addition, the Senate will make policy recommendations on matters affecting faculty welfare including appointments, promotions, leaves of absence, honors, and remuneration. Article III outlines the appointment of two student members each to a number of committees. Article IV refers to constitutional amendments. An appendix lists the functions of the Senate committees. (ERIC)

127. Governance Report. New York: Queens College, City University of New York, November 1969.

This "Governance Report," attacking "fundamental and important campus issues," grew out of the work of a committee of students, faculty and administration. It recommends creation of an Academic Senate to replace the Faculty Senate as the supreme legislative body of Queens College. It is to be composed of 54 tenured faculty, 18 non-tenured faculty, and 36 students as well as several ex-officio, non-voting members. Rules governing meetings and selection of members are included. The Senate is to have the power to: determine policies, standards, programs and goals of the College; safeguard academic freedom, advise and consent on the appointment of the president and all deans, recommend candidates for the presidency and deanships as vacancies occur; propose amendments and revisions to the By-laws of the Board of Higher Education; and provide for the implementation of the foregoing powers. (ERIC)

128. "Governing a College: A Unified Command." College Management 9, May 1969, pp. 48-49.

This article describes a new unicameral university senate adopted by the University of New Hampshire. The senate is composed of 30 faculty members, 30 undergraduates, 12 administrators and five graduate students. Other features of the plan are also given. (Shulman) See also 91, 101, 131, 132.

129. The Governing of Princeton University. Final Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University, April 1970.

This report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University proposes extensive modifications in the governing of Princeton University. Part I discusses the University's procedures for making decisions on important policy issues, including undergraduate and graduate courses of study, the appointment and advancement of members of the faculty, research contracts, the University's affiliation with other organizations and institutions, rules of conduct, and conflicts of interest. Part II discusses the organization of the University, including the Board of Trustees, the Presidency, the organization of the faculty, the undergraduate assembly, the organization of the graduate student body, a University Ombudsman, and a Committee on the Future of the University. Part III suggests ways of improving communication among the various constituents of the University. The recommendations on the proposed changes are included in the appendix. (ERIC) See also 134.

130. Hodgkinson, Harold L. The Campus Senate: Experiment in Democracy. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1974.

This study, undertaken in 1972-73, examined the operation of broadly based campus senates. Such bodies are typically unicameral legislative or advisory groups (usually to the chief executive), made up of students, faculty, and administrators. The report outlines their composition and powers and analyzes their effectiveness at varying types of institutions. It concludes that their success will depend not only on the issues and the types of individuals that make up the body, but also on regulating the senate process, training its members, and explicitly defining its jurisdiction. (Wren)

131. Jenks, R. Stephen and Others. Report of the Committee on Government Organization. Durham: University of New Hampshire, March 6, 1969.

This report presents in detail a unicameral government structure with supporting student and faculty caucuses, recommended for the University of New Hampshire by its Committee on Government Organization to (1) provide maximum participation to all members of the university community on a fair and equitable basis, and (2) provide a more efficient structure than the existing one with its competing power groups. The proposed 77-member University Senate would comprise 30 undergraduate students, 30 faculty members, 12 administrators and five graduate students. Its work would be organized by an internal Executive Council that would, among other things, serve the President of the University in an advisory capacity, prepare the agenda for Senate meetings, recommend nominations to all Senate committees, and take actions on an interim basis. (ERIC) See also 91, 101, 128, 132.

132. Jenks, R. Stephen and Others. The Student Role in Faculty Selection, Evaluation and Retention. Durham: University of New Hampshire, November 10, 1969.

Arguing that it is difficult to discuss the student's role in faculty selection, evaluation and retention outside the broader context of the student's role in decision making, the author describes the new unicameral system at the University of New Hampshire and some of the processes the institution went through in achieving the reorganization. The Committee on Government Organization found that most institutions that had recently included students in the governance process had done so by adding students to existing decision-making bodies. They decided that merely adding students to the Old University Senate "would leave an already inefficient and unwieldy body even more so" and thus a complete restructuring was necessary. Two convocations and many open meetings were held to explain the details and purposes of the proposed changes before they were approved by a referendum, the president and the board of trustees. The new Senate held its first meeting in June 1969. (ERIC) See also 91, 101, 128, 131.

133. A Progress Report by the Committee on University Governance. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, May 6, 1969.

Based on its conclusion that a unicameral senate would be both desirable and feasible, Florida Atlantic University's Committee on University Governance drafted a

proposal to establish a "single university-wide Senate, which truly represents Administration, Faculty, and Students." The two parts of the proposal present (1) the composition of the Senate membership and procedures for selecting Senate members; and (2) the composition and number of Senate committees. This report discusses both parts in detail. The proposed 139-member Senate would comprise 70 faculty members, 48 students, and 21 administrative officers, all of whom would serve one-year terms. Fifty faculty members would be elected by college and 20 others would be elected at-large. Four student members would be elected from each of eight colleges in the fall of each year; the three student officers and 21 student members-at-large would be elected in yearly spring elections. No election procedure would be required for the administrative officers, all of whom would be ex officio members. Senate committee members would serve one-year terms on eleven committees that would deal with the following matters: university budget; steering and policy; promotion, tenure, and honorary degrees; academic freedom and due process; admissions and petitions; curriculum; research; library; publications; physical space; and cultural affairs and activities. (ERIC)

134. A Proposal to Establish the Council of the Princeton University Community. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University, May 1969.

To effect a system of university governance in which a broad range of opinion may be brought to bear on policy issues and in which differences of opinion within and among groups may be heard, Princeton University's Special Committee on the Structure of the University has proposed the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community. The proposed Council would have the authority to "consider and investigate any question of University policy, any aspect of the governing of the University, and any general issue related to the welfare of the University." Part I of this report presents the basic features of the Council, and states how it may be expected to operate in practice and how it would fit into Princeton's governmental structure. Part II contains the Charter of the Council, which describes the authority, membership, organization, and procedures of the proposed Council. (ERIC) See also 129.

135. Proposed Constitution for a University Senate of Morehead State University. Recommendation of the Special Committee on University Governance. Morehead, Ky.: Morehead State University, May 20, 1969.

This proposed constitution was approved by the faculty of Morehead State University in May 1969, and by the Board of Regents in June 1969. The Senate's duties are to act: as an advisory body in developing institutional policies; as a liaison among various elements in the University and between those elements and the Board of Regents; as a deliberative body on any issue that might arise; and as a coordinator of the work of University committees. Students are voting members of the new Senate. Rules governing their election are included. (ERIC)

136. Revised Report of the Committee on University Governance. Binghamton: State University of New York, March 14, 1969.

The Committee on University Governance of the State University of New York at Binghamton was established to investigate the institution's system of governance and to recommend changes that were necessary for instituting a system of communal governance. The Committee was composed of elected representatives from four groups: undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and administration. The Committee's report, based on the concept that the university is a community, presents a new form of governance in which authority and responsibility in university decision-making are shared by students, faculty, and administration. Section I details the structure of college, graduate school, and university assemblies. Sections II to V cover educational policies, admissions, university personnel policy and procedures, and social regulations. Section VI recommends an integrated judicial system composed of four levels of boards, and specifies their respective areas of jurisdiction. Sections VII to IX discuss the rights and obligations of faculty, students, and administrators, amendment procedures for changing the overall structure of university governance, and implementation of the proposals in the report. If the system is approved, it would be implemented not later than September 1969, reviewed at the end of three years of operation, and again ratified by the four constituencies. (ERIC)

137. Second Interim Report of the Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University, March 17, 1969.

The Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University was appointed "to study and recommend changes

in the basic structure of the University." The second interim report contains recommendations of the Committee on the participation of faculty and students in university governance through a proposed University Senate that would replace the existing University Council and the Advisory Committee on the Faculties to the President. Each school would be represented by at least one elected member in the Senate, and the President of the University would be the presiding officer. The power and duties of this unicameral body would include those set forth in Sections 22 through 24 of the University's Statutes. The Senate would also have powers, with the concurrence of the trustees, to act in the area of faculty, students, and staff conduct. These powers would be supplemented by the responsibility to propose and recommend courses of action in matters affecting more than one school or faculty, others surrounding university relations with its affiliates, and any matters of university-wide concern. The Committee also recommends that procedures be established whereby the Senate would be consulted on certain matters for which the trustees have the ultimate responsibility, and that additional opportunities be fostered at school, faculty, or departmental levels for meaningful faculty and student participation in university affairs. (ERIC) See also 101, 138.

138. Third Interim Report of the Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University, May 12, 1969.

In their third interim report, the Trustees of Columbia University responded to a proposal on the participation of faculty and students in the governance of the University on the University-wide level. Specifically, they adopted an Executive Committee resolution to establish a representative University Senate. The resolution had earlier been overwhelmingly approved by a vote of almost 44% of the faculty and students. The Special Committee recommended that the Deans of Columbia College and Graduate Faculties be included in the Senate membership and clarified the role of the Trustees. Accompanying the report are the Statutes of the University related to the establishment of the new Senate. The Statutes contain provisions on the election, eligibility, recall and terms of office of faculty, students, administrators, and other representatives, and on the responsibilities and powers of the Senate. (ERIC) See also 101, 137.

139. "Two Heads Are Better Than One." College Management, May 1969, pp. 45-47.

This article describes the proposal for a new bicameral system of governance at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Its main provisions would draw the existing faculty and student senates together in a bicameral government under a central cabinet composed of six faculty, six students, the academic dean, and the president. Other provisions include: (1) election of several faculty to the Senate by students, (2) election of several students to the Congress by faculty, and (3) filling several seats by chance lottery. (Wren) See also 122.